

LIVING LIFE IN THE MIDDLE?  
MULTIRACIALS, RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND THE FATE OF THE U.S.

COLOR-LINE

A Dissertation

by

JESSICA MONIQUE BARRON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Rogelio Saenz
Co-Chair of Committee	Jane Sell
Committee Members,	Mark Fossett
	Mary Campbell
	Alex McIntosh
Head of Department,	Jane Sell

December 2013

Major Subject: Sociology

Copyright2013 Jessica Monique Barron

## ABSTRACT

A vast amount of social sciences research investigates the residential segregation of racial groups in the U.S. however very little is known regarding the segregation of multiracial Americans. The principle aim of this research is to examine the segregation patterns of mixed-race adults but to do so within a broader perspective. The segregation patterns found in this study are used as a proxy for the social position of multiracial groups, addressing the tenets of six varied perspectives, spanning the disciplines of race and ethnicity, demography, and economics. This study examines segregation patterns of multiracial adults in 49 U.S. cities using various summary indicators acquired with data from the 2010 U.S. Census. This study incorporates a recent methodological innovation by drawing on refined versions of segregation indices that improve the quality of segregation estimates in situations involving small groups such as the multiracial population. Three main findings emerged: 1) multiracial segregation patterns vary from the patterns of their single-race counterparts, 2) multiracial segregation patterns vary across type of multiracial combination and 3) residential outcomes for multiracials vary across urban areas and regions of the country. These findings suggest that contrary to the contemporary perspectives on social position of racial groups, multiracials hold various positions in the racial hierarchy based on racial composition.

## DEDICATION

To the Barron and Villa Families.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chairs, Dr. Rogelio Saenz and Dr. Jane Sell, and my committee members, Dr. Fossett, Dr. Campbell, and Dr. McIntosh, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research.

Thanks also go to my friends and colleagues and the department faculty and staff for making my time at Texas A&M University a great experience. I also want to extend my gratitude to the staff at the Texas Census Research and Data Center for their tireless support, guidance, and long walks around the lake during this project. Mark, Amber, and Bethany, this couldn't have been done without you.

Finally, thanks to my mother, father and siblings for their sacrifice and constant encouragement. This degree truly belongs to you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION: LIFE IN THE RACIAL MIDDLE? .....	1
CHAPTER II MULTIRACIAL AMERICA .....	6
The Movement .....	13
Multiracial Individuals and Residential Segregation .....	20
Multiracial Groups in this Study .....	29
CHAPTER III THE COLOR-LINE: A THEORETICAL APPROACH .....	38
Theories of Race and Social Position .....	41
A Review .....	77
CHAPTER IV DATA AND METHODS: AN INTERVENTION .....	82
Hypotheses, Research Design and Plan of Analysis .....	82
Population Groups Examined .....	86
Data and Methods .....	90
Summary Measures of Residential Segregation .....	95
Summary Measures of Residential Contact/Exposure .....	108
Measure of Neighborhood Diversity .....	110
CHAPTER V LIVING ON DIFFERENT LEVELS: SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS .....	112
Population Parameters .....	113
Marital Status .....	116
Socioeconomic Attainment .....	118
Measures of Acculturation .....	119
Conclusion .....	122

CHAPTER VI MAKING CONTACT.....	124
Overall Group Contact .....	125
Neighborhood Diversity Index.....	131
Five Category Measure of Distribution by Neighborhood Proportion White.....	137
Place Variation .....	153
Conclusion .....	154
CHAPTER VII LIVING UNEVEN.....	155
Leaving Biases at the Door: Measures of Uneven Distribution.....	156
Segregation Beyond Black and White .....	158
Black-White Multiracial (BW) Segregation.....	159
Asian-White Multiracial (AW) Segregation .....	176
Black-Asian Multiracial (BA) Segregation.....	191
CHAPTER VIII CONCLUSION: MULTIRACIALS, SEGREGATION AND A NEW THEORETICAL FRONTIER.....	209
Multiracials: The New Frontier .....	210
Living Life in the Middle: Residential Segregation Beyond Black and White...	212
Different Manifestations of the Racial Hierarchy? A Theoretical Approach .....	214
Variation: Theoretical Limitations .....	218
Limitations: Latino/a Multiracials.....	219
Into the Future .....	221
REFERENCES.....	223

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
3.1 Segregation Relationships and Theoretical Perspectives .....	78
4.1 Population Group Examined .....	86
5.1 Sociodemographic Characteristics by Racial Group.....	114
6.1 Overall Group Contact with Whites.....	126
6.2 Overall Group Contact with Blacks .....	127
6.3 Overall Group Contact with Asians .....	129
6.4 Overall Group Contact with Latino/as .....	130
6.5 Overall Group Contact with Diversity .....	132
6.6 Detailed City Sample: Contact with Whites.....	135
6.7 City Level Diversity .....	139
6.8 White Contact with Whites, Distribution of Whites over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White.....	142
6.9 Black Contact with Whites, Distribution of Blacks over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White.....	145
6.10 Asian Contact with Whites, Distribution of Asians over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White.....	146
6.11 Latino/a Contact with Whites, Distribution of Latino/as over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White.....	147
6.12 Black-White Contact with Whites, Distribution of Black-White over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent .....	149
6.13 Asian-White Contact with Whites, Distribution of Asian-White over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White.....	151
6.14 Black-Asian Contact with Whites, Distribution of Black-Asian over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White.....	152

7.1	Black-White Comparison .....	160
7.2	Detailed City Analysis of the White-Black Comparison.....	162
7.3	White-BW Comparison.....	167
7.4	Detailed City Analysis of the White-BW Comparison .....	168
7.5	Black-BW Comparison .....	172
7.6	Detailed City Analysis of the Black-BW Comparison.....	173
7.7	Asian-White Comparison.....	177
7.8	Detailed City Analysis of White-Asian Comparison .....	178
7.9	White-AW Comparison.....	182
7.10	Detailed City Analysis of White-AW Comparison.....	183
7.11	Asian-AW Comparison .....	187
7.12	Detailed City Analysis of Asian-AW Comparison .....	188
7.13	Black-Asian Comparison .....	193
7.14	Detailed City Analysis of Black-Asian Comparison.....	194
7.15	Black-BA Comparison .....	198
7.16	Detailed City Analysis of Black-BA Comparison .....	199
7.17	Asian-BA Comparison .....	203
7.18	Detailed City Analysis of Asian-BA Comparison .....	204



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION: LIFE IN THE RACIAL MIDDLE?

A vast body of social science research on residential segregation reveals implications for the life chances and social position of racial minorities in America (Massey and Denton 1993; Charles 2003; Alba and Logan 1993; Clark 1986, 1988; Jargowsky 1996). The vastly and rapidly changing U.S. racial landscape calls for a more expansive reach that includes the investigation of groups outside of the black-white binary and factors such as continuous immigration, that contribute to newly observed segregated spatial patterns (Hao and Fong 2010). Of growing interest are the residential patterns of new emerging groups in the U.S. (Iceland 2004; Farrell and Lee 2011; Glaeser and Vigdor 2001). This developing line of inquiry has increased our knowledge of the changing dynamics of U.S. race relations among Asians, Latino/as, and Blacks; however, we know relatively little about the housing patterns of multiracial Americans—a group of increasing importance, especially in light of the “check all that apply” racial identification option on the 2000 Census. The principle aim of this research is to examine housing patterns of mixed-race adults but to do so within a broader perspective.

As divergent perspectives concerning the future of U.S. racial and ethnic relations take shape, which tend to argue for or against a binary or multi-tiered racial structure, the social position of multiracial Americans in the racial hierarchy remains highly contested. This study seeks to examine the housing patterns of multiracials as an

indicator of their social position, addressing the tenets of six varied perspectives spanning the disciplines of race and ethnicity, demography, and economics. This study seeks to investigate how contemporary perspectives on the racial order in the United States situate emerging racial groups. Are these theoretical frameworks useful in understanding how emerging racial groups, such as the multiracial population, are positioning themselves or being positioned in the U.S. racial order? These questions invite an investigation of the broader implications of the residential patterns of the multiracial population.

Residential location and the degree of separation have long been recognized as indicators of a group's relative social position in society. Theories of intergroup contact, conflict, incorporation and alienation have all used patterns of spatial distribution as indicators however largely limited to the study of Blacks and whites and other larger pan-ethnic groups (Park et al 1925; Lieberman 1980; Lieberman and Waters 1988; Alba and Nee 2003). The same can be said for the study of residential segregation as a whole. Residential segregation research is vastly dominated by handful of comparisons, namely those between Blacks and Whites. More research is beginning to branch out to explore other comparisons but this line of investigation remains limited in its endeavors. The spatial distribution of the multiracial population is a departure from these trends, presenting new opportunities for investigation and expansion of empirical and theoretical studies of residential segregation and social position. Multiracials present a strategic group for this type of analysis for the following reasons, 1) they are important empirically, experiencing exponential growth since their recognition in the 2000 U.S.

Census, however relatively nothing is known in their residential experience, the type of neighborhoods they seek, which groups they are more likely to live with and so on. 2) Theoretically they provide insight into how segregation is structured given this group is comprised of those with overlapping racial identities, some of which represent groups historically experiencing the most social distance (e.g. Black-white biracials) 3) as a result, multiracials offer a kind of comparison that is fundamentally different than larger single-race, pan-ethnic comparisons that have dominated the residential segregation literature. To accomplish this goal I utilize innovative techniques for assessment of residential segregation amongst small groups to improve upon previous research designs in ways that will enable this project to contribute to a more comprehensive investigation of the theoretical frameworks on racial order and social distance as indicated by the residential segregation of mixed-race groups.

Lastly, the investigation of the social position of the multiracial population provides a new reflection on the nation's changing racial boundaries. The anticipated findings will extend to measure larger assumptions of assimilation, incorporation and inequality, traditionally limited to immigrant and pan-ethnic groups. The contribution of this proposed study also makes an immediate impact on studying racial residential segregation with the incorporation of new formulations of segregation indices that make it possible to more accurately understand the segregation patterns of small groups such as the multiracial population—a solution to problems that have historically limited the investigation of various populations. I expect that these improvements in methods and incorporation of an alternative population will lead to substantive contributions as well,

as I expect to gain new insights to the theoretical implications of the spatial distribution of multiracial groups.

The chapters in this study are structured as follows: Chapter 2 provides an overview of the multiracial population in the U.S. This chapter covers the history of multiracials in this country, the Multiracial Movement and subsequent change to the 2000 Census race question, as well as an overview of popular research trajectories of this population. Furthermore, I discuss in detail the limited work that has been done on residential segregation and multiracial families to provide insights into potential patterns in this study. Chapter 3 offers a theoretical overview of select perspectives in the fields of race relations and residential segregation to offer predictions for the residential outcomes pursued in this study. Chapter 4 provides a detailed discussion of the hypotheses, research design, plan of analysis and methods used in this study. Chapter 5 engages a sociodemographic comparison between the groups in this study to offer insights specifically relating to two theoretical perspectives: *spatial assimilation and eclectic group differences*. Chapter 6 begins the detailed empirical analysis featuring three different measures of overall group contact and exposure. All groups are used in this analysis, which aids in understanding residential segregation patterns when all groups are present. Chapter 7 uses measure of uneven distribution to gauge segregation amongst multiracials and their parent groups only. This chapter also features a methodological advancement for the study of segregation amongst small groups. Chapter 8 is the final chapter and presents a discussion the main findings of the analysis and their

implications on theoretical perspectives surrounding the social position of groups.

Limitations and future research are also discussed here.

## CHAPTER II

### MULTIRACIAL AMERICA

In 2010, the U.S. Census reported that 9 million people identified themselves as multiracial, a record in part made possible by the socio-historical and legal endorsement of interracial relationships handed down by the *Loving vs. Commonwealth of Virginia* case in 1967. What came to follow three decades later was the greatest change in the measurement of race in the history of the U.S. Census (Farley 2002). A new precedent changed the way the U.S. measured racial identification, reflecting an overall shift in the view that race is conceived of as a bounded category (Hirschman et al 2000; Farley 2002; Perlmann and Waters 2002).

The 2000 U.S. Census was the first to offer respondents the option to select more than one racial category on the racial identification section. The “check all that apply” option marked the first time the Census allowed multiracial self-identification. Previously, the Census displayed multiracial categories; however it was the observer, often times a federal marshal, who identified those that were deemed multiracial (Hochschild and Powell 2008; Snipp 1989). Between 1850 and 1930, the Census added categories such as *mulatto*, *quadroon*, and *octoroon* to the racial classification schemes. The demographic upheaval in the United States at the time was connected to a reorganization of the racial order (Hochschild and Powell 2008). Social, political and legally recognized boundaries between groups shifted as new groups emerged and others were freed. All recognized racial groups were impacted reflecting changes in Census

racial classification policies. Racial boundaries were of political consequence and scientifically backed by the eugenics movement (Gould 1996; Omi and Winant 1994). The White supremacist concepts of “pure races”, “inferior races” and “biological races” fueled the shifts in the racial categorization schemes during this time. For the multiracial population, tracking them through the blood quantum approach, at its core, was an effort by those in power to track those, and their decedents, who stepped outside these rigid categories and “muddled up the races” (Farley 2002; Gould 1996). Racial boundaries through strictly imposed racial categories were a part of a larger process of social and political control on the part of elite Whites (Lopez 2006). Whites in power desired to maintain power through subordinating groups deemed inferior, making sure they remained socially, physically and politically segregated from those in the “superior” category (DuBois 1899). The “Negro” “Indian” and “Caucasian” communities were disproportionately tracked and identified by the terms above due to the social, political, scientific and legal concerns surrounding the concepts of racial purity, superiority and inferiority (Hochschild and Powell 2008). Mulatto, octoroon, and quadroon were all dropped from the census by the start of the Second World War.

Thus for the vast majority of the Census lifespan, the federal statistical system had classified each respondent into a single-race. This is no longer the case. After the 2000 Census was tabulated, it was reported that 6.8 million individuals identified as multiracial<sup>1</sup>. The three largest groups to identify as multiracial were White-some other

---

<sup>1</sup>In the 2000 Census there was an error in data processing resulting in an overestimation of the Two or More Races population by about 1 million people nationally (about 15 percent), which is almost entirely affected by race combinations involving Some Other Race. Included in the multiple-race population are those who wrote in Hispanic term for their second race. The Census Bureau issued a Data Note to advise

race<sup>2</sup>, American Indian-White, and Asian-White. Geographically, the largest concentration of multiracial reporting was found in the West (Hawaii, Alaska and California are the top of the list) and the lowest in the Deep South.

In total, the multiracial population represented 2.4% of the U.S. population. These reports reflected an increased interest in multiracial persons by the academy. New reports of the contemporary multiracial population resulted in a boom in multiracial research spanning disciplines, methodologies, and foci. The most popular trends became studying Black-White biracials (Rockquemore and Brunnsma 2002, 2008; Brunnsma 2006a; Davis 2002; Korgen and O'Brien 2006), interracial marriage and family (predominately Black-White couples) (Chito Childs 2002; Brunnsma 2006b; Dalmage 2000; Yancey 2007; Hitlin, Brown, and Elder 2006; Saenz et al 1995; Harris and Sims 2002), and identity development and processes (Brunnsma and Rockquemore 2001; Khanna and Johnson 2010, 2005; Daniel 1992).

A decade later, the multiracial population has seen sizable growth as well as expanded research interests and trajectories within the academy. According to the *2010 Census Brief*<sup>3</sup>, the multiracial population has increased one-third in size since 2000.

---

data users about the processing error. Therefore, data users are encouraged to assess observed changes in the *total* Two or More Races population between Census 2000 and the 2010 Census with caution and should instead examine changes in specific race combinations involving OMB race groups, to detailed insights into the Two or More Races Population. *The Two or More Races Population: 2010 Census Brief*, pg. 4.

<sup>2</sup> The most popular combination, reported by one third of those who identified with two or more races was White and "some other race." Typically, these were people who marked both the box for White and the box for "some other race" and then wrote in a term denoting Hispanic origin. These patterns in selection amongst the Hispanic population reflect an interpretation of the census form that may not be reflecting a multiracial identity but rather inadequacies in the way the census organized the race question for the Latina/o population.

<sup>3</sup>*Two or More Races: 2010 Census Brief*, [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov)



Considering that the 2000 count was overstated by about 15 percent nationally, the percentage change for people reporting more than one race could actually be higher. Amongst multiracial groups exceeding 1 million in size are the Black-White population, Some Other Race-White, Asian-White, and White-American Indian and Alaska Native. The West remains the region with the largest number (3.4 million) and the highest percentage (4.6%) of people who reported more than one race. However, the number and proportion of people who reported more than one race increased in all four regions and every county in the United States had respondents who reported multiple races. Amongst specific racial combinations, groups saw an increase in number from 2000 to 2010 resulting in the multiracial population overall, experiencing a substantial growth among people who reported more than one race.

A decade after the 2000 Census, the academy has seen a wealth of multiracial literature expanding into topics such health and the family (Bratter and Gorman, 2011; Woo et al. 2011; Bratter and Eschbach, 2006), adoption (Jackson and Samuels 2012; Samuels 2009), the college experience (Renn 2000), methodological interventions (Leibler and Halpern-Manners 2008), socioeconomic mobility (Korgen 2010), immigration (Lee and Bean 2004; 2007), policy (Campbell and Herman, 2010; Sanchez et al 2010) and the future of race relations all together (Bonilla-Silva 2004; Lee & Bean, 2007); Gans 1999; Gallagher 2007; Saenz and Morales 2005). Yet less scholarly attention has been paid to multiracials outside of the Black-White binary along with double minority status multiracials (Romo, 2011); Campbell, 2007; Jimenez 2003; Williams-Leon and Nakashima 2001; Thornton 1983; Hall 1980; Lenard 1992; Guevarra

2003; Wallace 2001; DeBose and Winters 2003), media representation (Chito-Childs 2009; Beltran and Fojas 2008) and adulthood and the experiences throughout the life cycle such as residential attainment, marriage patterns, and lifespan (Quain and Lichter 2007; Bennett 2011; Wright et al 2011; Holloway et al 2005). Despite these understudied areas, scholars of multiracial persons are providing new theoretical conceptualizations and creative methodological advancements to continue the progression of scholarship on this vastly growing population.

Bare in mind, however, multiracial persons have always been a part of our nation's racial landscape given our history with slavery, colonization and immigration (Hirschman 2004; Rockquemore and Brunnsma 2008; Du Bois 1903). Still, it was not until the 1980's when the term multiracial was actually coined in various government, academic, and public service arenas (Root 1992). Before then, a variety of theories and approaches guided discussions of this somewhat shunned, stigmatized, and hidden population. The theories surrounding multiracial identity took three major historical trajectories: the *Problem Approach*, *Equivalent Approach*, and *Variant Approach* (Wiheyesinghe and Jackson III 2001). The vast majority of these theoretical approaches were based solely on the experience of the Black-White multiracial persons. The narrowed focus is primarily a result of the deep socio-historic relationship between Blacks and Whites in the U.S. (Winters and DeBose 2003; Rockquemore and Brunnsma 2008).

The *Problem Approach* was developed following Park's (1928) *Marginal Man* analysis in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Park's notion of multiracial status was one

of a relatively permanent period of crisis given that biracial persons were anticipated as being rejected from members of each of their single-race groups. This would leave them unable to assimilate fully into a racial group, relegating them to become strangers to their single-race groups (Wiheyesinghe and Jackson III 2001; Campbell and Eggerling-Boek 2006). Park's argument suggests that marginality is in itself pathological and associated with psychological distress and conflict by virtue of living between two antagonistic social realities. However, Park also conceived of multiracial persons on the side of either positive marginality or liminality. This is the state of being associated with people who are simultaneously members of two or more culturally distinct groups. This allows them to move beyond an "either/or" to be "both/neither" on their path of identification based on a wider range of understanding (Daniel 2002; Campbell and Eggerling-Beck 2006). However, Park's argument is often simplified and in some ways misinterpreted to suggest multiracial identity should be considered only as marginal people in our monoracial society. They are not fully White and not fully Black and thus will lead a marginalized existence. This view was adopted by scholars, physicians, educators and mainstream society and can still be found in contemporary discourse. A multiracial existence was viewed as problematic to its core and a threat to the individual's mental and physical health (Root 1990; Wiheyesinghe and Jackson III 2001).

The *Equivalent Approach* addresses the residue of the one-drop rule in contemporary society while reifying ideas of racial purity and biological racial distinctions. This approach views multiraciality as a tainted racial categorization. If a

person is Black and White, they are the equivalent to a Black person. They are ineligible for the consideration of membership to Whiteness as their pure White blood is tainted by non-White blood (Rockquemore and Brunsma 2008). Historically anyone who was Black and White was legally considered Black regardless of phenotype and cultural affiliation. This is a structural view of racial identification in that society imposes racial identities on citizens regardless of individual preference or case (Wiheyesinghe and Jackson III 2001; Lopez 2006). And given that the U.S. is governed by a monoracial system, deeply rooted in White supremacist ideologies of racial separation, imposed identification is common practice. Once the rule lessened in importance for legal distinctions, it continues to be embraced by the greater public and other multiracials of varied White and non-White compositions (Winters and DeBose 2003). In fact, during the Civil Rights Movement, the Black community adopted this notion as a means of inclusion in the struggle for equality (Williams 2006; Farley 2002). The once imposed, one-drop rule was now embraced by communities of color, Black communities in particular, as a source of solidarity and a rejection of internal division along skin color/ancestry lines (Davis 2002). However, the historic subordination of dual minority multiracial groups complicates this approach, as these groups do not have access or claims to Whiteness (Romo 2011).

Lastly, the *Variant Approach* addresses multiracial identity not as problematic but rather a process with a variety of endpoints. This approach gained momentum in the 1990's when there was an increased interest in the academy in identity politics (Rockquemore and Brunsma 2008). Maria Root (1990) spearheaded this approach,

addressing multiracial status as a unique racial identity. She problematized the assumptions of multiracial status as a health and mental risk by exposing their racist implications. Root (1992) stated that it was neither appropriate nor healthy for multiracials to seek one endpoint in their racial identity. Multiracial identity can take a variety of paths with a variety of endpoints. And unlike monoracial models of racial identification, multiracial identity is not linear or static, thus it can change throughout the life course depending on a variety of variables. The Variant Approach moved the analysis of identity from structures affecting choice to stages of development.

Increased awareness of this population, resulting in part from advocacy by newly formed coalitions and organizations, ultimately was reflected in the ability to identify as multiracial in the 2000 Census (DeCosta 2007; Brunsma and Rockquemore 2001; Renn 2000; Rockquemore and Brunsma 2002 ). Just as the *Loving v. Virginia* case in the late 1960's helped shape demographic shifts in the multiracial community, the *Multiracial Movement* in the latter part of the twentieth century presented the U.S. with a unique social movement that greatly impacted our understanding of multiracial persons, and race and ethnicity more broadly.

### **The Movement**

Public discourse surrounding the multiracial community increased exponentially by the 1970's with the rise in identity politics (which emphasized authenticity) and on the heels of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950's and 1960's (which encouraged the recording of racial data to ensure enforcement of the law). The "multiracial boom" followed up in the 1980's, raising a different consciousness surrounding mixed-race

issues. Against this backdrop, multiracial individuals were encouraged to question how their identities were classified. Historically individuals' racial classification was assigned to the racial group of the lower-status parent. The only group for which this was not common practice was the American Indian population (Snipp 1989). In an attempt to "assimilate" American Indians through intermarriage, children of these unions were often stripped of any knowledge of their tribal affiliations and merged into Whiteness (Snipp 2002). This practice resulted in the American Indian population having one of the longest histories of intermarriage in the U.S. (Snipp 2002).

However, for other groups, the one-drop rule was no longer legally viable. Starting in the 1990's every major media outlet—*USA Today*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *TIME*, *Newsweek*, and *MTV* - featured cover stories regarding the multiracial population (Williams-Leon 2003). By the latter part of the decade, heated debates regarding the transition of a private multiracial identity on a public stage began to take form. Spearheading these debates were organizations—mostly led by the White mothers of multiracial children—that sought to create a sense of belonging, safety and the sharing of similar experiences (DeCosta 2007; Daniel and Cataneda-Liles 2006; Sundstrom 2001). Additionally the difficulties multiracial families faced in confronting the normative model of the "American family" were highlighted (DeCosta 2007). Out of this racial climate multiracial organizations argued that in order to safeguard their equal protection rights, they were entitled to have the most appropriate and accurate racial classification recorded.

In 1997 OMB decided to add the “check all that apply” option to the Census, which for the first time placed multiracial identity amongst other identities in the longstanding racial self-classification system. However, this “victory” and the overall movement did not come without its critics. The multiracial movement received disapproval and push-back from various well-known organizations and members of minority communities. Namely, the development of strong anti-discrimination and voting rights laws and affirmative-action policies needed clear and simple race categories to place individuals for the purposes of documenting and redressing discrimination (Perlmann and Waters 2002; Williams 2006). If the selection of one or more races was permissible, this could reduce the total population of minority groups and thus impact their hard-fought political gains. Perlmann and Waters (2002) write:

“What is new today is not the effort to decide the legal standing of the mixed-race individual; that effort is as old as British North America. It was a staple of racist laws and court decisions from the colonial era until well into this century...what is new today is how to determine the count of an entire protected group when the size of the groups is a factor in a decision about discrimination. Can the status of mixed-race individuals under civil rights legislation provide a clear guide for determining who to include in the count of a protected group?” (pp. 15-16 in *The New Race Question*.)

On a broader scale, these classification debates represent two sides of the coin. On the one hand, formal classification acknowledges the increasing population of the offspring of interracial marriage and to recognize that there are patterns to understand and investigate regarding this group. And, on the other hand, there is the need for simplicity, clarity and the absence of ambiguity in the system for counting that underlies civil and voting rights laws and programs such as affirmative action (Farely 2002; Williams

2006). Individually each can be seen as advancing racial equality—by highlighting how old divides have been eroded or by working directly to attack the divides that yet remain high. However, these opposing claims are most likely not going to be seen in their best light. Meaning, both are seen by the opposing side as eroding the progress that they are fighting for and that each stance represents (Williams 2006).

In the middle of the debate was the U.S. Census. The federal government, through the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), was met with the task of how to count people who marked more than one race and how those counts of race would be aggregated from the raw data. Race counts are essentially used by the Census for two main purposes: 1) used in projections about the future racial composition of the U.S. population and 2) they are to be used in connection with legislative and judicial actions involving civil rights and voting rights as well as in educational and health statistics. After these considerations, the Census adopted the tabulation tactic such that, if a respondent is “half minority” they are counted as a minority<sup>4</sup>. Ironically, in our nation’s racist legal past, individuals with “one-drop” of Black blood (or some other very low fraction of Black origins) were defined as Black; therefore, the means of redress in the civil rights era are tabulated by the same principle (Farley 2002; Persily 2002).

Secondary debates emerged as some critics argued that the pressure to create a multiracial category comes from White mothers who have non-White children. They speculated their intentions might come from their own racism or to protect their child

---

<sup>4</sup>For a detailed discussion of the tabulation of race counts based on Civil Rights voting laws and other legislation, see chapters 4, 6, and 16 in the edited volume, *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals* (Perlmann and Waters 2002).



from society's racism, seeking to resist their child being identified as Black, Asian, or American Indian. Ultimately critics claimed the movement inherently encouraged the positive valuation of Whiteness and the degradation of communities of color. In a way the claims to a multiracial identity were viewed by communities of color as an escape from being a "person of color". Thus a multiracial identity is viewed as a form of social climbing within the hierarchy of color. It is an identity that would fail to challenge the hierarchy and instead contribute to the oppression of communities of color (Sundstrom 2001; Daniel and Castaneda-Liles 2006). A multiracial identity should be seen as something private, critics argued, and not a public (political) identity as it could do nothing to combat racism (Hochschild and Weaver 2010). Instead, the fear of the movement is that it would cause a shift in the racial order resulting in multiracial identity to produce a new mechanism of racial distribution to further perpetuate a racially hierarchical system. Multiracials would rank higher than any other minority group because of their partial claim to Whiteness. Again, this claim is omitting the presence of dual minority status multiracials. Lastly, the undertones of the movement were thought to reify the notion of "racial purity" that many scholars and communities of color had fought so hard to refute. The idea of a mixed-race advances the false biological beliefs about race and true monoracial identities in which two pure races tend to mix from time to time (Jacobson 2002).

On a larger, philosophical level, the multiracial movement begged the question, is being multiracial enough to garner a new category? Is multiracial status unique? Is a personal identity enough to be reaffirmed politically? Do multiracial groups share

anything in common to foster a sense of “groupness” or shared identity? Thornton (1992), a mixed-race scholar himself, critiqued the movement by stating,

“By definition, racial labels are tools used to categorize and to separate and/or exclude. There remains insufficient social justification to exclude multiracials from other groups. While there is an experiential rationale for identifying unique experiences, that alone is not enough and does not provide a consistent basis to describe multiracials as one sort of people” (1992:325).

DeCosta (2007) writes that ironically while multiracial individuals struggled to receive the right to choose their identities, they were doing so among a given set of options. Thus while multiracial activists fought for a new racial classification, one that recognizes and legitimated their multiracial identities, they did so within the longstanding U.S. racial order. They did not change it; they just added a new category, affirming the right of the state to use racial terms to label individuals. Although their reasons for the disapproval of a multiracial recognition varied, all traditional minority communities were united in their opposition for a multiracial category from the beginning (DeCosta 2007; Williams-Leon 2003; Brunsma 2005; Sundstrom 2001).

However, the movement elucidates how individuals come to define and redefine their identities—figuratively and literally—changing the official and normative boundaries of race and ethnicity while simultaneously illustrating the resistant and solidified nature of the American racial order (DeCosta 2007; Harris and Sims 2002; Rockquemore and Brunsma 2008). Traditional racial or ethnic loyalties and understandings remain strong, including among multiracial communities. Hochschild and

Weaver (2010) anticipate that mixed-race identification will evolve into a multiracial identity, but it may not be at the expense of existing group consciousness. Instead, they expect mixed-race identity to be contextual, fluid, and additive, so that it can be layered onto rather than substituted for traditional monoracial commitments. If in fact the multiracial movement successfully challenges longstanding racial practices and ideologies surrounding racial categorization and identity, it has the potential to change much of the politics and policy of American race relations.

The rise in identity politics fueled the small but highly effective multiracial movement and resulted in the inclusion of the “check all that apply” revision to the racial identification section on the 2000 U.S. Census. To date, the multiracial community continues to stir up debates regarding the social position of mixed-race Americans and the fate of racial conceptualizations, structures and hierarchies more broadly (Perlmann and Waters 2002; Lee and Bean 2004; Gallagher 2007).

Because these groups occupy a multiplicity of racial identities they serve as a bellwether of how the boundaries of race may expand, contract or be refined. More broadly, literature concerning which theoretical models best predicts racial and ethnic incorporation or exclusion benefit from the examination of the social position of mixed-race groups in the U.S. Thus multiracials can tell us something fundamentally different about U.S. race relations that can in turn have some predictive value to understand the fate of the U.S. race relations, and the lifespan of the current racial order (Lee and Bean 2004, 2007). One such way to achieve this is to examine the residential patterns of multiracial groups as a proxy for their social position in our contemporary racial

hierarchy. For example, if a Black-White multiracial person lived closer to Whites than to any other racial group, could we say this is a sign of boundary shifting, maintenance, crossing, blurring or something else (Alba and Logan 1993; Alba 1999). Are we finding that multiracials both part-White and dual minority status are experiencing similar constraints in the housing market compared to other minority groups or will we find that they are crossing boundaries and blurring neighborhood lines in a way that is different from their single-race counterparts? This dissertation will seek to undertake a series of similar inquiries in order to understand the residential patterns of multiracials and what these patterns have to say about the U.S. color-line more broadly.

### **Multiracial Individuals and Residential Segregation**

The residential patterns of racial and ethnic groups are an important indicator of the social position of these groups. Whether voluntary or involuntary, living in racially segregated neighborhoods has serious implications for the present and future mobility opportunities of those who are included or excluded from desirable areas (Charles 2003). Sociologists and policymakers have long viewed racial residential segregation as a fundamental aspect of racial inequality, implicated in both intergroup relations and in larger processes of individual and group social mobility (Jargowsky 1996, Wacquant and Wilson 1989; Clark 1992; Krysan and Farley 2002; Iceland and Wilkes 2006; Bennett 2011). Consequently, it is important to understand how the multiracial population fares in residential settlement in comparison to other racial and ethnic groups to more fully understand the social position of the multiracial population in the U.S. Furthermore, it is important to understand how multiracial individuals fare in patterns that drastically

impact established issues of racial inequality. It is necessary here to note that there is a growing body of literature in geography and sociology that examines the residential patterns of mixed-race households (the race of the householder is different from the children and/or spouse or long-term partner) (Bratter 2007; Dalmage 2000; Ellis et al. 2012; Holloway et al. 2005, 2008; Wright et al. 2011). Dalmage (2000) uses ethnographic methods as well as interviews from Black/White families in their neighborhoods in Chicago and New York in 1995. Dalmage analyzes the experiences and perspectives of multiracial family members to see how race is constructed in and central to, daily life. She finds that multiracial families try their best to live in communities and neighborhoods that are more racially diverse in which their daily interactions (grocery store, parks, neighbors) would be one of racial inclusion and institutionally, their families would be supported and welcomed (school, leisure, interaction with law enforcement).

Wright et al. (2011) investigate whether Black/White households in 12 large U.S. metro-areas are more likely to be found in racially diverse neighborhoods than households headed by White or Black couples. Using map analysis, they show Black/White headed households are most often found in moderately diverse White neighborhoods—however the relationship varies by metro-area context. Controlling for SES, Black/White couples are drawn to diversity no matter what racial group forms the neighborhood majority. Similarly, in their 12 metro-area study, Holloway et al. (2005) found all mixed-race households in the study (Black-White, Latino-White, Asian-White, American Indian-White, Black-Latino) show more moderate levels of racial residential

exposure than do same-race households. Simply put, residential contact with members of other races is substantially less likely for people in same-race households. These studies provide insight into the types neighborhoods that multiracial individuals are likely to grow up in and potentially desire in adulthood.

In examining the effect of mixed-race households on measuring residential segregation, Ellis et al. (2012) found that Black/White mixed-race families, as opposed to mixed-race families of other racial compositions, are unlike other mixed-race household combinations in that they are more likely to live in the most diverse neighborhoods. Additionally, they do not gravitate to White or Black dominated tracts, even when they have high incomes or are highly educated. They ask the question, what is the sensitivity of neighborhood racial segregation measures on levels of household-scale racial mixing? What is the relationship between neighborhood racial diversity and the presence of mixed-race households? They used micro data from the 1990 Census and summary measures of unevenness and exposure. They found that mixing within households has meaningful effects on the measurement of neighborhood segregation. This finding suggests that patterns of mixed-race household formation and residential location condition understandings of neighborhood segregation dynamics. They found that racial mixing at the scale of the household should be factored into explanations and interpretations of levels of segregation in neighborhoods. Mixed-race households often represent the largest proportion of diversity in the most segregated neighborhoods of all metropolitan areas. Without racial diversity within households, neighborhood segregation in 1990 measured by dissimilarity and exposure would have been markedly

higher. Thus, mixed-race households provide a disproportionate source of neighborhood diversity in the least racially plural neighborhoods. The methodological intervention presented in this project will address such issues and present a means for guarding against the inflation of segregation measures as a result of the presence of mixed-race persons in neighborhoods.

These studies provide advancement to segregation research by changing our interpretation of common measures of residential segregation while providing valuable insight to the types of neighborhoods that multiracial families seek out and reside in. However multiracial households and multiracial individuals are distinctively different groups. To this end, the residential patterns and experiences of multiracial households can only offer potential inferences as to the types of neighborhoods multiracials may reside in during adulthood. A separate and direct line of investigation specifically targeting the residential patterns and experiences of multiracial individuals is therefore necessary.

A recent study by Bennett (2011) is among the first to investigate the residential patterns of multiracial individuals. Using data from the 2000 Census, Bennett incorporates residential segregation scores of multiracial individuals as a proxy for the group position in the racial hierarchy of society. The study focused on the three largest non-Hispanic mixed-race groups (Black-White, Asian-White, and American Indian-White) and examined segregation for cities with a minimum multiracial population of 2,500 multiracial. The choice to include American Indian-White multiracials is a controversial one. This particular multiracial group is often comprised of those claiming

a “symbolic ethnicity” with very little daily practice or “lived-identity” with regard to their American Indian heritage (Snipp 2002; Waters 1990). The complicated history with American Indians and the monetary awards given to those who can effectively claim their “Indian-ness” complicates many studies regarding this particular population (Snipp 2002). Previous research suggests that while American Indians have extensive out-marriage rates, incentives for monetary gains, or the lack of consequence to claim this particular minority status, the claims to multiraciality may be misleading on the Census form (Snipp 1989, 2002).

Additionally, Bennett selected metropolitan areas with at least 2,500 multiracial persons yielding 66 metros for Black-White persons, 59 for Asian-White persons, and 68 for American Indian-White persons. The specific metro areas for each group are not given nor are there a discussion of regional or cross-city variation. Spatial differences within and among cities and regions of the country are neglected the reporting of segregation scores for each group. This provides an opportunity for the research presented in this study to discuss the implication of place variation in residential outcomes for mixed-race groups. Additionally, Bennett uses Census tracts as the spatial unit of analysis. Using tract-level is not an uncommon choice when investigating segregation of traditionally larger pan-ethnic groups such as Blacks and Whites. However, for smaller group comparisons, such as the multiracial population, tracts tend to miss a lot of the segregation present in the metro area, and in many ways can eliminate how much variation there is among the group comparisons. Smaller spatial units, such as block level data, offer more reliable scores when dealing with small



populations. The research presented in my study will utilize block level data. A more detailed discussion of block level data and its benefits will be presented in the methods chapter.

The Bennett study makes use of total population for both the single-race and mixed-race groups. Bennett argues, “as customary, segregation indices are based on data for all group members...” (pg. 716). While this argument is warranted, it is not the only avenue for calculating segregation indices. However much of the claim for including children comes from the fact that children make up a larger share of the multiracial population than the single-race population (Jones and Smith 2001). She claims the larger representation of children among the multiracial population relative to the single-race population should have few substantive implications for her conclusions as children are more segregated than is the total population (Logan et al 2001). Namely she states that if anything, including children will slightly raise levels of segregation for multiracial groups compared to those for single-race groups. While this logic is useful in terms of increasing the number of cases, it is not the only practice when utilizing segregation indices. Other studies have sliced the population into groups of interest to address specific questions related to issues such as gender or racial differences in homeownership (Charles 2003). Including the total population or separating out specific groups from the total population alter the questions that are asked and the conclusions drawn regarding the findings presented. Including children in a study such as Bennett’s invites the discussion of potential household dynamics such as protecting children for

potentially hostile environments, which may not be as compelling for other groups within that population.

Lastly, Bennett uses two measures of segregation: 1) the index of dissimilarity to measure the unevenness of two groups at the tract level, used to approximate neighborhoods and 2) the exposure index to describe the racial composition of the typical neighborhood of group members. However, what was missing from the analysis were the limitations for these measures, particularly the well-known fact that the indices measuring uneven distribution tend to break down with smaller populations, inflating scores and ultimately subject to upward biased in reporting (Fossett 2008; Massey and Fischer 1999). Not taking this limitation of the primary measure into account runs the risk of less reliable interpretations regarding the scores reported.

Although no formal tables present segregation scores for any of the cities in the study, Bennett utilizes simple bar graphs to stage the average segregation scores for each multiracial group. The results suggest, on average, mixed-race persons were less segregated from Whites than racial minorities. Mixed-race groups experienced higher levels of integration with Whites than with their single-race minority counterparts. Bennett found that the mixed-race groups lived with more Whites and fewer single-race minorities than did Blacks, Asians, and American Indians. So much so that it was concluded that multiracials, on average, lived in predominately White neighborhoods. Although she only presents averages and ranges, Bennett observes that American Indian-White persons reached a high of 71.7 percent White neighborhoods. Additionally, American Indian-White persons experienced the highest level of residential exposure to

Whites, with a 59.0 percent chance of encountering Whites, by virtue of sharing neighborhoods with them. Overall, American Indian-White multiracials lived in the “Whitest” neighborhoods on average, in comparison to other groups. However, as stated previously, researchers must be cautious when examining American Indian-White multiracials given the high rates of intermarriage and mixed-ancestry leading to a great deal of volatility in the reporting of the American Indian group overall (Snipp 1989, 2002). This would of course impact residential patterns if a larger portion of these mixed-race American Indians are potentially White persons claiming a sort of “symbolic” ethnicity.

In addition, the overall high level of exposure to Whites among each group means that multiracial persons had low levels of exposure to racial minorities. In particular she found that neighborhoods that American Indian-White persons reside in, typically contained only 1.7 percent American Indians and the rest, White. Now it is not clear where these cities are located and if this is the pattern in and across cities. Nonetheless, Bennett found that the overall patterns of inequality observed among single-race minorities are reflected in the residential experiences of multiracial groups. This means Black-White multiracials were more segregated from Whites than the other two groups in the study, however not by much. Multiracial neighborhoods on average were compositionally different (more White) from their minority counterparts. The study concludes these mixed-race groups occupy a position in the middle of the U.S. racial order but one that is itself racially stratified.

While Bennett's (2011) study is among the first to examine the residential patterns of multiracials, it is limited in its measurement, lack of detail in methodological approach and presentation of data, and utilizes a controversial multiracial group without addressing the implications of their inclusion. Additionally, Bennett's study was not able to take advantage of the newest tabulations available from the 2010 Census. I deviate from Bennett's approach in four distinct ways in an attempt to advance the investigation of the residential patterns of this under-researched group while investigating the utility of various theoretical perspectives that make claims regarding the social position of racial and ethnic groups. Namely, this study differs in data source and spatial units, approaches to measurement, theoretical orientation and differences in the populations under study. These deviations will extend Bennett's work with the help of more reliable measures, and offer a fuller picture of the residential patterns of multiracial persons.

Additionally, the new racial and ethnic landscape of our country's metropolitan areas raises new questions and new challenges for studies of racial and ethnic residential pattern and group relations. The rapidly changing U.S. racial landscape requires that greater attention be directed toward previously understudied groups and it similarly requires that attention be given to factors such as continuous immigration, differential outcomes in the housing search process, and the emergence and sustainability of integrated neighborhoods that appear to play an important role in shaping contemporary segregation patterns (Iceland 2004; Farrell and Lee 2011). Finally, changing racial dynamics and increasingly diversity in residential patterns in U.S. cities raise questions

about how multiracial individuals broadly and various multiracial groups more specifically, will fit into the diversifying metropolis.

In the decade to follow the 2000 Census, academia experienced a substantial increase in studies focusing on the multiracial population, but the empirical literature on this rapidly growing group remains inadequate. As research needs to increase and new theoretical frames arise to address mixed-race persons, it is imperative that they be woven into the established literatures focusing on life outcomes and life chances of racial groups in the United States. Multiracial individuals offer another avenue for exploring and evaluating theories of how assimilation, discrimination, and group inequality shape the nation's current social system. This dissertation will use the outcomes of multiracial groups to test the predictions of several competing theories of racial incorporation. The following chapter will outline these theories, their main arguments, and discuss their potential utility in predicting the residential patterns of mixed-race groups.

### **Multiracial Groups in this Study**

As stated above, multiracial identity has generated intense discourse spanning decades leading to the production of a wide and dense body of literature that is ever expanding. The overwhelming focus on multiracial identification speaks profoundly to the meaning of race in American society and to perceptions about the permeability and rigidity of racial/ethnic boundaries. Multiracial identity constitutes a significant marker of social change because identifying as multiracial reflects a jettisoning of the exclusive and absolutist bases of racial categorization that have long marked racial construction in

this country (Gans 1999). Multiracial identification thus provides an important analytical lens through which to gauge the placement, strength and shifts of America's color line.

Queries regarding multiracial identity are outside the scope of this project. Instead, I would like to expand existing multiracial research to incorporate multiracials into the established literatures focusing on life outcomes and life chances of racial groups in the United States. Throughout this project I use the term multiracial or mixed-race to refer to people who identify with two or more racial heritages that are based on socially constructed criteria (e.g. U.S. Census categories). These individuals may be first-generation multiracial (parents are two differing racial groups) or may have a mixed-race familial heritage (Lou et al 2011; Rockquemore and Brunsma 2008). Additionally the discussion of multiracials in this study is within the U.S. context. Multiracial individuals offer another avenue for exploring and evaluating theories of how assimilation, discrimination, and group inequality shape the nation's current social system. As Rockquemore and Brunsma (2008) state, "Mixed race people and their complex racial identities have become part of our cultural, political, and social landscape" (2008:xii). Thus I am arguing to push beyond identity to engage in other social issues. Namely I am interested in how the change in the demography of race and ethnicity, namely the visibility and growth of the multiracial population in the U.S., has impacted today's color-line. Do multiracials more closely resemble Whites or non-Whites at this point in time? More specifically, do their residential patterns follow those of their single-race counterparts or reveal new patterns?

To begin breaking ground in this relatively new line of inquiry, I have chosen to compare three non-Hispanic biracial groups. This selection was made due to the fact that the majority of individuals who identified as multiracial selected only two groups on the 2010 Census. The majority of multiracial respondents are two races.<sup>5</sup> A detailed discussion of the project design and methods will be presented in a later section. For now, I will provide an overview of the various multiracial groups in this study.

### *Black-White Biracials*

To reiterate what has been previously stated, there is a wealth of literature dedicated to Black-White biracials namely because “Blacks and Whites continue to be the two groups with the greatest social distance, the most spatial separation and the strongest taboos against interracial marriage” (Rockquemore and Brunnsma 2002:335). Black-White biracials are often considered the bridging of the greatest divide between two of the groups with the most social distance. Moreover, this particular multiracial group is the only group to be legally subjected to the rule of hypodescent (Campbell 2007; Davis 2006; Waters 1990; Lee and Bean 2004). The rule of hypodescent or the “one drop rule” was legally used for centuries to force an African American identity on the children who were the product of a sexual union between a slave and slave master. The rule indicated that the one drop of Black blood makes one Black. It emerged in the 1600s to ensure that mixed-race persons of afro-descent remained in slavery. This rule historically constrained racial identity options for multiracials in a way that is absent for other groups, “For no other racial or ethnic group in the United States and in no other

---

<sup>5</sup>2010 U.S. Census Brief, Multiracial Population.

country does the one-drop rule so tightly circumscribed a group's identity choices" (Lee and Bean 2004:233).

When the one-drop rule lessened as an important legal distinction (post-slavery) it continued to be used in a social context (Winters and DeBose 2003). The phenomenon of "passing" for many nonWhite groups became common practice given the privilege that was attached to Whiteness. Passing as White secured all the advantages that accompanied Whiteness for these biracial individuals. During the Civil Rights era, many Black-Whitebiracials identified as Black due to underrepresentation politically, socially, economically, and educationally compared with Whites—a pattern established as along as the Black community has existed (Winters and DeBose 2003). In the contemporary era, Black-Whitebiracials continue to be among the largest multiracial groups in the 2010 U.S. Census (see Census briefs for more detail). Their size and established place in the literature and in U.S. history make this group an ideal comparison for understanding the contemporary social position of multiracials.

#### *Asian-White Biracials*

Asian-Whitebiracials are the third largest multiracial group in the 2010 U.S. Census. While this particular multiracial group is often researched in the larger context of war brides (Saenz et al 1994) in the marital exogamy literature, the higher rates of multiracial identification amongst Asians is intermarriage among the native-born population as well as rapidly growing trends in the immigrant intermarriage fueled by continuous immigration. Asians in the U.S. register one of the highest out-marriage rates of any racial minority, producing a visibly growing group of multiracial children



(Khanna 2005). Interracial marriage between Asians and Whites is often used to measure the integration of Asian Americans into American society (Okamoto, 2007); Fu and Hartfield 2000; Qian et al 2001). This line of inquiry comes from the long history this panethnic group has had in our country. Some groups arrived in large amounts 150 years ago and others only after 1965, when immigration laws changed in ways that allowed significantly increased migration from Asia. Specific Asian groups were on the receiving end of legislation that deeply impacted their experiences in the U.S. The *Chinese Exclusion Act* of 1882 and The *Gentleman's Agreement* of 1902 were legislation that barred Chinese and Japanese laborers from immigrating to the U.S. due to increasing fears about the influence of foreign cultures on American ways and economic competition from newcomers. The *National Origins Quota Act* (NOQ) 1921 limited the number of immigrants who could legally enter the U.S. by allowing only 3% of each national origin group in the U.S. This number was reduced to 2% in 1924 but no quotas were given to China, Japan or Korea impeding immigration to nearly nothing for these countries. However the *War Bride Act* of 1945 permitted American GIs to marry and bring over wives from Japan, China, the Philippines and Korea (Lee 2010). After the abolition of the NOQ in 1965, Asian immigration advanced at a high and steady rate. Currently there are more than 35 Asian ethnic groups living in the U.S. with their own languages, religions and cultures. These groups are a mix of immigrants, native-borns and refugees. This large pan-ethnic group increased the marriage pool for both Asians and non-Asians alike (Lee and Bean 2007).

Following high rates of out-marriage among various Asian groups, research on the racial identity patterns of their offspring began to take form (Aguirre et al. 1990; Saenz et al. 1995; Xie and Goyette 1997). Among other things, this multiracial group has the highest social class attainment levels of any other Asian multiracial group (Le 2010). This may result in more residential options for this multiracial group compared to others in this study. Nonetheless much like other multiracial individuals, multiracial Asian Americans are at times not considered to be “truly” Asian or White. And like the Black community, politically many worry that the Asian American community will lose government funding if people who previously identified themselves as solely Asian now identify themselves as multiracial (Williams-Leon 2002). Asian multiracials still face elements of distrust and hostility from both Asian and non-Asian sides. Yet, within the context of demographic, economic, and cultural changes in our contemporary racial landscape, it is important to understand how emerging groups are experiencing integration. Additionally, the exploration of Asian-White multiracials will complement existing studies of Black-White multiracials by providing a more general picture of experiences among those of White-majority racial mixes.

#### *Black-Asian Biracials*

Continuing in the vein of expanding multiracial research, I will incorporate a dual minority status multiracial group. The majority of multiracial research has failed to address the differences between minority-majority and minority-minority biracial individuals (Hall and Turner 2001; Romo 2011). The multiracial population constitutes a heterogeneous group with varied experiences.

Despite the limited research on dual minority status multiracials, the 1980's began investigating the diversity within the multiracial population to incorporate such groups. Hall (1980) provided the first large study on dual minority status biracial identity in the U.S.—studying Black-Japanese biracials. Additionally, Thornton (1982) turned his dissertation into one of the first in-depth studies on dual minority status multiracials. This study examined Black-Japanese multiracials. He found that various dimensions in which Black-Japanese biracials understand their place in the social landscape is determined by the mode of consciousness which has two general dimensions: American-biracial and Black-multiracial. The impact of a Black racial identity was important for this particular group, as the claim to Whiteness like their Asian-White counterparts was not an option. Instead for this group, selecting identification is a choice between affirming different minority identities (DeBose and Winters 2003; Thornton and Gates 2001; Herman 2004; Campbell 2007). How dual-minority individuals construct and claim multiracial identities has implications for debates on racial authenticity as well as shedding light on a growing population. In addition, how respondents choose and represent their identities reflect complex ongoing social interactions where dual minority multiracial identities are asserted, challenged and rejected by their non-White, single-race counterparts (Leonard 1992; Romo 2011). For the sake of this project, I am interested in self-identified dual minority status multiracials and the ways in which this population may encounter different social experiences than minority-majority multiracials and may further differ depending on the particular minority background (e.g. those with a Black racial signifier). With regards to residential patterns, this group

is of particular interest as they are representative of a “high” status minority group (Asians) and a “low” status minority group (Blacks). The residential outcomes investigated in this study have implications for the rigidity of the Black racial category, in residential outcomes. Residential patterns can offer a comparison of the effects of claiming a part-Black identity (Black-White multiracials and Black-Asian multiracials) to the effects of claiming a part-White identity (Black-White, Asian-White). If these patterns are different amongst groups, the desirability or stigma attached to certain racial identities will be amplified suggesting some permeability to the color-line.

Moreover, according to the 2010 Census, the “two or more races” population increased in size by one-third since 2000. Amongst the four largest groups were the Black-White (1.8 million) and Asian-White (1.6 million). These two groups also saw the most substantive growth in the last ten years. The Black-Asian category grew the fastest among multiple minority race combination groups that numbered 10,000 or more in size. While they represent only 2.3 percent of multiracial population they experienced about a 74 percent change in size since 2000 representing a growing demographic. Overall, the Asian-in-combination population represents 29.4 percent of the total multiracial population. While the total U.S. population increased by about nine percent many multiple race groups increased by 50 percent or more over ten years, thus multiracials grew much faster than their single-race counterparts. This growth is not only the result of demographic variable—births, deaths and migration—but also changes in identification from one census to another (Perlmann and Waters 2002; Farley 2002).

Because these groups occupy a multiplicity of racial identities they serve as a bellwether of how the boundaries of race may expand, contract or be refined. More broadly, literature concerning which theoretical models best predicts racial and ethnic incorporation or exclusion benefit from the examination of the social position of mixed-race groups in the U.S. Thus multiracials can tell us something fundamentally different about U.S. race relations that can in turn have some predictive value to understand the fate of the U.S. race relations, and the lifespan of the current racial order (Lee and Bean 2004, 2007). One such way to achieve this is to examine the residential patterns of multiracial groups as a proxy for their social position in our contemporary racial hierarchy. For example, if we were to find that Asian-White multiracials lived mostly with Asians rather than Whites, that pattern may signal boundary shifting in that Whites may no longer be the desirable group. If in fact these patterns vary or have no clear pattern at all, this may be a sign of boundary blurring, and so on. Residential patterns offer a way to investigate the social position of multiracials while offering insight into patterns that are virtually unknown in the literature.

## CHAPTER III

### THE COLOR-LINE: A THEORETICAL APPROACH

Reflecting on the impermeable bicategorical Black-White fault line that had historically and devastatingly divided the country, W.E.B. DuBois wrote, “The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the colorline” (1903: 1997:45). The question many are asking, is this still the *problem* of the day (O’Brien 2008; Dalmage 2000; Yancey 2007)?

Given our nation’s historical legacy with slavery, colonization, immigration, and intermarriage, the social sciences have a long tradition investigating the state and fate of America’s color-line. Theories of assimilation (Gordon 1964), Black exceptionalism (Myrdal 1944; DuBois 1903), race relations (Park 1928), social distance and competition (Park et al 1923), among others ruled the day in explaining the persistence of the bifurcating color-line that divided this country. Over the past five decades, demographic trends have invited divergent perspectives concerning the future of race relations in the U.S. to emerge yet again.

With the current demographic shifts in race and ethnicity, some scholars speculate the traditional Black-White color-line is losing its salience. Lee and Bean (2007) state,

“While today’s immigration (new immigrant groups) dramatizes the analytical inadequacy of Black-White color line, other social trends are also augmenting the racial, ethnic diversity of the United States, most notably the rise in intermarriage and the growth of the multiracial population” (2007:562).

This augmentation begs the question, is the incorporation experiences of America's newest nonWhite groups tracking those of the European predecessors, or are these groups becoming racialized minorities whose experiences are more akin to those of African Americans? Or are these groups carving out a space that is neither White nor Black, but their own racial middle (O'Brien 2008)? Multiracials serve as a unique group to answer some of these questions. Currently, many scholars have suggested America's racial order is still binary (whether White/nonWhite or Black/nonBlack) in which Blacks serve as a reference point to Whiteness and achievements of Whiteness. Others align with a tri-racial system in which new immigrant groups and multiracials are generally described as occupying the social space between Blacks and Whites (Gallagher 2007; Lee and Bean 2007; Barrett 2011; Bonilla-Silva 2004). Whether it is demographic forces (Jibou 1988) or racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Darity 2005) or a combination of both, the social position of various groups in our racial hierarchy remains contested.

As covered previously, multiracials have always been a part of our nation's racial landscape. However, with the recent inclusion on the 2000 Census, their presence in the public sphere has increased in influence. The prevalence and feelings about multiracial identification speak profoundly to the meaning of race in American society and to perceptions about the permeability and rigidity of racial/ethnic boundaries. Some of this momentum has revived age-old theoretical arguments about racial position and birthed alternative perspectives. In what is to follow is an overview of select theoretical perspectives within the traditions of sociology and demography. While not every theory directly addresses the multiracial population, they each have predictions for the state of

the racial hierarchy, the fate of the racial middle, and/or predictions regarding demographic shifts and spatial patterns. I recognize that a variety of perspectives that have received attention in the literature such as *racial formation* (Omi and Winant 1994), *racialized social systems* (Bonilla-Silva 1997), and *systemic racism* (Feagin 2000) are not included in this study. Primarily, these well known perspectives offer large-scale descriptive analysis of the way in which the racial hierarchy operates, and the formation of racialized identities but are relatively silent on predictions regarding the integration of groups into or out of the racial hierarchy. Those theories not listed in this analysis do not fail or lack utility when studying race relations, they instead have not engaged this issue from the vantage point of predictions for social position of emerging racial groups.

After reviewing each theory, I will offer hypotheses as to the prediction of residential dispersion for each multiracial group in this study. However, I am cautious about the presentation of these perspectives, as I understand this study is going to be a careful descriptive analysis considering this line of investigation is in fairly uncharted waters. I do have limits on how definitive these conclusions can be reached based on the predictions for each theoretical perspective. However approaching this study in this way provides a situation that give us the opportunity to think about a variety of ways that residential patterns and patterns of inequality in general can play out. With this in mind, a reasonable expectation is to provide the basics of each perspective, what they can each lead us to expect and then how this will aid in understanding multiracial patterns. After the presentation of the empirical data, we can see which perspectives offer the most utility in understanding these relatively unknown patterns.



## **Theories of Race and Social Position**

### *Binary Racial Order: White/Non-White, Black/Non-Black*

The arrival of the first slave on U.S. soil set in motion a racial order that would define this country along Black-White lines. The racial category of “Black” evolved with the consolidation of racial slavery in which the designation, “Black”, influenced by an ideology of exploitation based on racial logic, solidified the establishment and maintenance of a bicategorical racial system. Through slavery, the building of a White republic created a society of Whites at the top and Blacks at the bottom (Du Bois 1903; Feagin 2000; Bashi and McDaniels 1997). Whites developed legal systems, racial folklore, religious narratives and legal precedents that assisted in establishing specific racial identities, not only for slaves but for Whites and European settlers as well (Delgado 1989; Lopez 1994; Du Bois 1903; Davis 1981; Harris 1993). The U.S. soon became a country notorious for its rigid Black-White color line. This delineation consigns Blacks and Whites to a different set of positions in the social order and attached a different set of rights and privileges to each group. Even after emancipation, Black Codes and Jim Crow segregation aimed to solidify the color line and a structure in which Blacks would find themselves at the bottom. This was a structural and ideological endeavor that progressed the agenda of White supremacy. DuBois (1909) thus argued that the creation of the “other” is in fact, the creation of the “same.” As a result, the very idea of race assumes a hierarchy of racial groups (African = ideal type of savage, European = father of civilization). Thus the dichotomy finds itself as such a staple in the U.S. due to the foundation and preservation of White supremacy. This delineation

consigns Blacks and Whites to different positions in the social order and attaches a different set of rights and privileges to each group. The unique deprivations imposed on Blacks and the tensions spawned by the uneasy history of Black-White relations provided stark reminders of the strength of the divide through much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Yancey 2003; Feagin 2000; Lee and Bean 2007).

Much work on racial stratification argues for a binary racial system, one in which the color line is drawn such that Whites are on the advantaged side while Blacks are on the other (Myrdal 1962; Powell 2000). The binary framework finds its origins in the social practice of explicitly defining who was Black (one-drop rule), simultaneously contributing to the larger racial project of policing the boundary of who is to be considered White. There are two variations of this binary. The White/non-White perspective (O'Brien 2008; Lee and Bean 2007; Barrett 2011; Yancey 2003) will be discussed here.

#### *White/Non-White*

At its core the White/non-White perspective stands on two main assumptions: 1) explicit definition of who is Black and White and 2) Whiteness is the key to accessing power and privilege in the U.S. (Harris 1993). The explicit racial designations are often noted as a sociohistoric process rooted in systems of oppression and economic subjugation. The most notable signifier of this perspective is the rule of hypo-descent or the *one-drop rule*. According to this “rule” if anyone is believed to have “one drop of Negro blood” they are in fact a Negro, and thus stripped of all ability to live anything other than a subjugated identity (Yancey 2003; Farely 2002). The rule emerged in the

1600s to ensure that mixed-race persons (generally the product of the rape of a slave by her master) of afro-decent remained in slavery (Andrews 2004; Dodson 2001). Legally, this rule was used for centuries to enforce the “choice” of an African American identity (Snipp 2003). And although “one drop” was enough to receive a Black identity, federal records were kept to track family lineage to ensure that there would be no claim to Whiteness. The rule offered a form of social control not only to regulate Black-White interactions, but also to reinforce the notion of “pure” biological races. The rule of hypo-decent avoided ambiguity of an intermediate identity.

However, the history of Black and White relations does not exist in a vacuum. Before slavery and after, other racial and ethnic groups who were either native to this land, indentured servants or immigrants to this country existed in the midst of this Black-White racial order. A binary racial order was not inevitable. The U.S. could have had a far more complex racial system early on. However, due to the influences of White supremacy, colonization and slavery, the binary system prevailed making all groups subject to a placement within this binary. It was no longer just about distancing themselves from Blacks, but from all potential racial “others,” real or imagined.

As stated before, the one-drop rule was used in part to fortify the boundaries of who was to be considered White. Those who are “not quite White” were denied full benefits of a White racial designation and thus the ability to become citizens (before 1952) and all the power and privileges associated with Whiteness (Lopez 2006). In the White/non-White binary, Whiteness was to be protected at all costs. Some of the most notable examples of protected Whiteness are the Supreme Court cases of *Ozawa v.*

*United States* 1922 and *United States v. Thind* 1923. In each case, Asian men (one Japanese and the other Asian Indian) argued before the court that they should be allowed to naturalize on the basis that the restriction of citizenship to ‘free White persons’ in the Naturalization Act of 1790 should include them (Lopez 2006). Each was denied citizenship due to the Supreme Court’s argument that they could not claim Whiteness. Ozawa, who claimed Whiteness due to his skin color, lack of ties to Japan, and assimilation into the American culture, was told that his skin color (White) was not an adequate indicator of Whiteness, as those who were Japanese were not commonly recognized as a part of the *Caucasian* race. Yet only a year later, Thind was also denied citizenship for his inability to prove he was White even though Asian Indian was scientifically classified as Caucasian. The Supreme Court “clarified” that neither skin color nor categorization in the Caucasian race qualified one to claim Whiteness and therefore citizenship. The court concluded that Thind was not the particular kind of Caucasian (the kind the “common man” thought of as White)<sup>6</sup> that was allowed to naturalize and was thus denied citizenship (Lopez 2006). In the binary racial order, legal precedents, racial ideology, and scientific racism (Gould 1997) all worked in tandem to limit the number of people who could lay claim to the power and privileges afforded to Whites (Roediger 2001; Jacobson 1999). In this the core of the White/non-White binary was the maintenance of Whiteness. For those who do not quite meet the requirements, their access to the full benefits of Whiteness is intangible (O’Brian 2008; Warren and Twine 1997; Bonilla-Silva 2004; Telles and Ortiz 2008; Flores and Roman 2009).

---

<sup>6</sup>For full discussion of the “common man” logic, see Haney-Lopez *White By Law* And Gould, *Mismeasurement of Man*.

Much of the research on the White/non-White racial order contends non-White groups, including multiracials, are expected to occupy positions at the bottom of the racial order. Thus, this framework would predict that *all* multiracial people would be segregated from Whites, just as other racial minorities are, because they would be seen as non-White.

While this perspective overlooks intra-group variation within the multiracial community (and other non-White groups more broadly) this perspective provides a benchmark for all other perspectives in this analysis. As new scholars contend that we have moved past a strictly White/non-White society, it is important to know if that is truly the case. This variation of the binary racial order framework is often overlooked as an outdated categorization of the current racial order in the U.S. However, other scholars would interject that emerging theories on the fate of a bi-categorical color line predict that members in an “intermediary” space, call for a repositioning of the White category. This would allow some to stake claim more than others, privileging a ‘White’ status over all others. The repositioning of the White category would offer a symbolic, social and political claim to Whiteness, harkening back to the underlining premise of the Supreme Court cases outlined earlier (Bennett 2011; Waters 1990; 1999).

### *Segregation Patterns*

In terms of residence, this translates into all multiracial groups experiencing high levels of segregation from Whites and lower levels of segregation from non-White groups. This perspective combines nonWhite groups on the basis of their racialized minority status and connotes that they share similar subordinate status vis-à-vis Whites

(Lee and Bean 2007). By homogenizing the experiences of all nonWhite groups, boundaries among nonWhite groups are less distinct and salient than the boundary separating Whites and nonWhites. Accordingly we would expect, any group, regardless of racial composition, will experience high levels of segregation from Whites, while non-White and multiracial groups will experience low levels of segregation from other nonWhite groups.

### *Black-Non-Black*

The unique deprivations imposed on Blacks and the tensions spawned by the uneasy history of Black-White relations revived the discussion of an alternative binary color line. In the 1990's the emergence of this alternative binary highlighted the unique separation of Blacks, not only from Whites but also from other non-White racial and ethnic groups. Again, shifts in the demography of race in this country changed the discussion to understand the incorporation processes of non-White racial and ethnic groups. Did non-White immigrant groups follow the same paths of cultural and economic amalgamation with Whites and severe distancing from Blacks as did their European predecessors? Is there a "racial redistricting" as Gallagher (2007) claims, with Asians, Latinos/as and multiracials able to easily glide into the White category (although we have work to contend that the incorporation of European groups into Whiteness was not an overall easy process—see Roediger 2002)? Gallagher follows up his argument by stating multiracial Asians and Latinos/as are not similarly perceived as monoracially Latino/as or Asians in the same way Black multiracials are, giving them the option to claim Whiteness if they chose. Thus, many contend that Black Americans represent the

“other” against which Whiteness is constructed. “Throughout the history of the U.S. Blacks have served a critical role in the construction and expansion of Whiteness by serving as the definition of what White is not” (Lee and Bean 2007:567)

In his book *Who Is White*, Yancey (2003) shows that African Americans face more racial segregation than other racial groups, and do not, or perhaps more precisely, *cannot* engage in the same level of structural or marital assimilation as non-Black racial minorities. This evidence suggests that the experience of African Americans may be qualitatively different from that of other racial groups (Gans 1999; Waters 1999; Bashi and McDaniels 1997). He highlights these differences in his *African American Alienation Thesis*, which he ultimately argues, African Americans are destined to remain an outcast race. Even if Blacks want to become part of the dominant culture, the barriers they face prevent them from gaining membership in the majority society (Waters 1999; Model 2008; Lacy 2007). The twin major claims of the alienation thesis are that African American will continue to suffer a disproportionate level of alienation within U.S. society and that non-Black racial minorities will begin to accept dominant group status over time. This leads to the prediction that instead of Whites becoming a numerical minority group in the near future we are heading toward a Black/non-Black society wherein African Americans remain anchored to the bottom of the racial hierarchy in the United States and the other groups become a large, privileged comparison group. Members of the Black community are in a quasi-caste system by which they occupy the lowest level of social prestige in the U.S. and it is in the social interests of all non-Black racial groups to keep them at the bottom. Additionally, he claims the “one-drop rule”

will apply to Black multiracials in that they will find themselves at the bottom of the racial order due to the rigidity of Black racial identity.

In contrast to the White/non-White binary, Yancey (2003) predicts that non-Black groups may enter into the dominant culture as either a process of assimilation or one in which their ethnic/racial identity is thinned. He states these processes of inclusion may be contextually different but result in the same effect, namely that African Americans will be left at the bottom of the racial hierarchy. He argues that merging of Latinos/as and Asian Americans into the dominant culture is inevitable. Like others who address this emerging Black/non-Black divide, Yancey (2003) expects the Black/non-Black dichotomy to emerge as a result of the growth of the Latino/a and Asian American populations. In this model Blacks will experience chronic alienation and powerlessness in the social order while the racial identities of Latino/as and Asians will initiate a process of 'thinning,' declining in salience for them as they increasingly access the privileges of Whiteness, much like the White ethnics before them (Gallagher 2007; Waters 1999; Lee and Stevens 2003; Lee and Bean 2007).

### *Segregation Relationships*

According to this perspective, we can expect Black-Asians and Black-White multiracials to experience low levels of segregation from Blacks and high levels of segregation from Whites and other non-Black groups. Similarly, we would expect Asian-White multiracials to experience higher levels of contact with Whites and other non-Black minority groups than any other multiracial group and the furthest distance from Black groups.



*Latin Americanization Thesis*

Bonilla-Silva (2004) argues that the United States is moving from a two-tier, White/non-White, racial stratification system toward a three-tier systems that consists of the following categories: (1) White, (2) honorary White, and (3) collective Black. He contends that the racial discourse and the racial and ethnic stratification system of the United States will resemble the much more complex patterns observed in Latin American countries such as Brazil, Belize and Colombia. In this racial hierarchy, while a traditional “White” category remains at the top of the racial/ethnic hierarchy, “new Whites” (Russians, Albanians etc.), some assimilated Latinos, some multiracials and some other groups, dependent upon skin shade, are likely to be placed into a newly emerging middle category of “honorary White.” This middle category will serve an important buffering function between “Whites” and “the collective Black.” The collective Black category includes not only African Americans but darker and poorer Asian groups (Filipino, Vietnamese, etc.), darker Latino/as (Puerto Ricans and Dominicans), West Indian immigrants and reservation-bound Native Americans.

Bonilla-Silva argues there will be a categorical porosity—individual members of racial strata moving up (or down) the stratification system - and a categorical pigmentocracy—the rank ordering of groups and members of groups according to phenotype and cultural characteristics. In the *Latin Americanization Thesis* (LAT), group development does not take a long time to form. Classifying as White, groups will develop “White-like” racial attitudes benefitting their new social position—differentiating themselves from collective Blacks. To this end, there are specific features

of this three-tier system outlined by Bonilla-Silva. First, explicit Black–White conflict will be reduced as the presence of intermediate groups complicates traditional racial hierarchies and tensions. Second, new forms of “shade discrimination” also known as “colorism” will dominate the three-tier stratification system. Third, this more nuanced and complex system will be accompanied by a new racial discourse. According to Bonilla-Silva, if a three-tier racial stratification system is in fact emerging in the U.S. context, one would expect individuals to express racial attitudes that reflect their location in the racial order. For example, one would expect Whites to affirm and defend their advantaged position while establishing a relationship with members of the honorary White group. The honorary White group will exaggerate their similarities with Whites while distancing themselves from the collective Black group. They also may tend toward embracing positions Whites hold as membership in the buffer groups is tenuous at best and the threat of being demoted to the collective Black status is ever present should they challenge White advantage. Collective Black members are projected to create intragroup hierarchies based primarily on skin tone.

Bonilla-Silva’s approach is not an entirely new concept as other scholars (specifically addressing new immigrant groups) have discussed tri-racial systems (Forman 2002; O’Brien 2008; Lee and Bean 2007; Barrett 2011; Warren and Twine 1997; Gans 1999). These theories conceive of the racial hierarchy as a newly formed structure that incorporates new immigrant groups in a way that White supremacy will still be maintained. This inherently creates an intermediate racial group to buffer racial conflict between Whites and Blacks. O’Brien (2008) contends tri-racial systems offer a

buffer group status for some, with access to privilege and esteem not widely afforded to people of color, but it would be a conditional status, having the potential to be revoked in times of economic crisis or any other time in which those in power deem them no longer worthy. Still, the middle is generally the same—not quite fully White but with more privileges than other minority groups.

Yet these variations of a three-tiered racial system can be separated out by their approach to their middle tier. From a Whiteness perspective, our society is viewed as stratified on the basis of who has access to Whiteness or honorary Whiteness. Inherently these tri-tiered theories are critiqued as lacking a true intermediary space but instead should be viewed as a modified binary. The LAT these is often criticized as lacking a true intermediary given that there is less permanence in the middle(Barrett 2011). The LAT states that at some point in time, an honorary White position can turn into a permanent White position. Thus, if the intermediary space is conceived of in a permanent sense, the LAT can be viewed as a modified binary.

On the other hand, three-tiered theories that center their “middle” on multiracials discuss the permanence of an intermediary space, which in some respects holds a static notion of race that it is socially constructed, and biologically fixed. This results in an undifferentiated middle in which Whites are at the top, the middle is the middle with no differentiation of non/White groups and then Blacks are on the bottom (i.e. White-multiracial-Black or White-honorary-White-collective Black). A stratified middle approach argues that multiracials as a group are generally described as occupying the social space between Blacks and Whites but stratified on the basis of who has access to

Whiteness (Barrett 2011). Those who are part White and those who are not are expected to experience different positions in the middle. Although the LAT is more concerned with a focus on access to Whiteness rather than a stratified approach to the racial middle, it is important to keep in mind that there are different variations and orientations to the racial middle.

In order to operationalizes LAT assumptions, Bonilla-Silva suggests empirically examining ‘objective’ (income and education), ‘subjective’ (racial attitudes and self-classification) and ‘social interaction’ (intermarriage and residential segregation) indicators. For example, he projects higher intermarriage rates amongst the theorized “collective White” groups and Whites will live closer to those they identify as honorary Whites.

While this theory has grown in popularity over the years, it is not without its limitations. For the purposes of this study, I am concerned with the failure to predict the relative strength of the boundaries in the model (i.e. are the distances between the first and second tier the same between the second and third). This lack of clarity neglects the inherent complexity and at times ambiguity in the categorization scheme within each of the three categories. In some ways this lack of clarity makes it challenging to execute the empirical tests that Bonilla-Silva suggests. However, the lack of an exhaustive list of groups in each category does not make this theory useless. The LAT does implicate the placement of some multiracials in the various categories based on the status of the racial groups they are identifying. I would then contend that Asian-White multiracials, for example, would find themselves in the White category while Black-White multiracials

or dual minority status multiracials such as Black-Asians will find themselves in the honorary White category. The LAT does not anticipate any multiracial group in the collective Black category.

### *Segregation Relationships*

The LAT makes the claim that those in the “honorary White” category can expect more social and intimate contact with “Whites.” Thus the LAT would expect no multiracial group to experience high levels of segregation from Whites, but rather moderate levels. Thus, multiracial groups are expected to experience moderate to high levels of segregation from those in the collective Black group and lowest levels of segregation from other groups in the honorary White category.

### *Spatial Assimilation*

In an effort to explain the persistence of racial residential segregation, particularly among Black Americans despite antidiscrimination legislation (Fair Housing Act 1968) and the expanding Black middle class, three competing explanations among demographers emerged. Two will be discussed in this project and one is outlined here in this section. *Spatial Assimilation* theory emphasized group differences across social class status, arguing that objective difference in socioeconomic status and acculturation account for residential segregation. Namely, a higher socioeconomic status, increased educational attainment, and occupational prestige will increase residential integration with the majority group. Individuals convert socioeconomic gains into higher-quality housing, often leaving ethnic neighborhoods for areas with more Whites. For immigrants, it also involves acculturation—the accumulation of time in the United States

and English language proficiency (Alba and Logan 1993; Massey and Denton 1985). In general, spatial assimilation views residential integration with Whites as a part of the greater assimilation process described in the more classic process of assimilation (Park 1928; Gordon 1964). Here integration reflects a group's acculturation and socioeconomic position but also facilitates its overall social mobility.

Spatial assimilation is a combination of status attainment perspectives with an ecological model. Beginning with the status attainment perspective, an important outcome of socioeconomic advancement for minorities is residential integration with *mainstream society* (middle to upper class Whites). As social status rises, minorities attempt to convert their socioeconomic achievements into an improved spatial position, which usually implies assimilation with majority-group members (Massey and Denton 1985). In the classical assimilation models, indicators of improved social location are geographic proximity to the dominant group. And again, only the ability to convert financial and human capital into favorable residential outcomes will result in spatial assimilation.

From the ecological perspective, the difference associated with (both inter- and intra-) group inequality in socioeconomic status played a major role in the access to resources for higher quality housing in spatially structured housing markets (urban and suburban) (Fossett 2008). These differences serve to relegate those in lower social positions to lower quality housing in less desirable areas that are marked by uniquely high crime and other social ills (Fossett 2008). Because predominantly White neighborhoods generally exhibit higher property values, these neighborhoods became

the most desirable. Socioeconomic resources are required for minorities to purchase residence in these desirable areas. However resources are scarce, resulting in competition amongst groups for access to resources to improve their social standing (Charles 2000). Thus minorities' incentive to reside near Whites is also thought to increase with advanced socioeconomic attainment. It is important to mention here that the spatial assimilation theory is part of a group of theoretical concepts that have a long history in social science research, particularly in human ecology. Social distance, congregation, centralization, competition, invasion, succession, and segregation, along with spatial assimilation are concepts that remain central to the efforts to describe and explain residential segregation and neighborhood change (Fossett 2008). Each of these approaches listed above can be a sufficient cause of segregation in their own right. Thus, it is easiest to group them into "demand" and "supply" side. However for the sake of this analysis, only spatial assimilation will be assessed.

Spatial assimilation falls into the "demand side" which produces segregation when "systematic differences in group means and/or preferences lead groups to cluster in different areas of the city as they select and attain residential locations in urban housing markets" (Fossett 2008:498). From this perspective, households of similar social position, based on ethnicity, status position, and stage of the life cycle, will have low "social distance" from each other based on similar social characteristics and group dynamics (Bogardus 1927; Duncan and Duncan 1955; Jargowsky 1996). As a result, higher status households and households from majority ethnic groups often develop a distaste for co-residing with lower-status households and minority ethnic groups.

Higher-status households seek to maintain spatial separation from these non-desirable groups and do so to minimize association with perceived “social inferiors” and to preserve their position in the social hierarchy (Duncan and Duncan 2008).

An extension of the demand-side perspective invariably highlights the development of extensive and established group differences in socioeconomic status characteristics among racial groups (Oliver and Shapiro 1995). This difference in many ways undergirds the spatial assimilation model. There is an underlying assumption that the persistence and severity of socioeconomic differences across race will invariably lead to the persistence of residential segregation by race. This effect, coupled with the changes in metropolitan-area characteristics such as suburbanization, will result in differences in status and associated differences in lifestyle (Wilson 1987, 1996; Massey and Denton 1985).

This perspective, unlike many of the previous perspectives outlined in this project, has a vast body of empirical research examining the implications for various groups using both aggregate and individual level data and various modeling techniques (Alba and Logan 1993; Massey and Denton 1985).

Aggregate and individual-level studies have produced much research on the residential patterns of racial groups. In general, these studies have found that higher SES racial and ethnic groups are less segregated than low SES groups from non-Hispanic Whites, but this effect is weaker among Blacks than among other minority groups. In particular, studies find that in the aggregate Latino/as and Asians showed substantial residential gains with improved socioeconomic status. However, at the individual level,



nativity, nation of origin (levels of affluence and poverty in home country) and ethnic enclaves impacts this finding, potentially weakening the “traditional” spatial assimilation process (Alba et al 1999; Charles 2003). Less is known, however about the degree to which differences between Latino/as and Whites or between nonWhite racial and ethnic groups results from group differences in socioeconomic status or country of birth.

Aggregate-level analysis dominated most studies of residential segregation. There are two types of aggregate-level analyses that are common. In the first, the population is separated into categories of a socioeconomic indicator (e.g. education, occupation, or income) and segregation indices are recalculated within categories of these select indicators. If segregation within categories of the indicator is similar to the overall level, researchers conclude that SES is not influential in residential outcomes for a group (Massey and Denton 1988; Massey and Fischer 1999). In the second type of aggregate-level analysis, multivariate models predict residential outcomes (e.g. probability of contact with Whites) using the average characteristics of Blacks, Latino/as, and Asians for a set of metropolitan areas—a technique that is used in the Bennett study outlined in the previous chapter. Under this framework, scholarship addressing the relationship between areas such as homeownership, income and education level on residential outcomes took shape (Fischer 2003; Iceland and Wilkes 2006; Massey and Fischer 1999). Aggregate level analysis has provided the field with valuable insight into patterns that suggested that Asians and Latinos/as are always substantially less segregated from Whites than are Blacks. Conversely, objective differences in socioeconomic status explain only part of Blacks’ residential outcomes (Alba and Logan

1993; Massey and Denton 1988). However, there are limitations to the aggregate level approach (see Charles 2003 for an exhaustive list) such as not being able to capture local differences that would account for contextual variations in residential locations (city center vs. suburb).

As a result, individual-level analyses, perfected over the past two decades, have enhanced our knowledge of residential outcomes by race. *Locational attainment models* have been particularly influential employing a broad range of social-class indicators, most notable homeownership and family status, to predict neighborhood-level outcomes such as median income, exposure to crime, etc. (Alba and Logan 1993). These studies provided methodological advancements that yielded interesting information, most notably that Blacks exhibit a positive association between socioeconomic status and residential outcomes, although their returns to education and income are significantly lower than for other groups. Especially troubling is the negative effect of homeownership on Blacks, residential outcomes (Alba et al. 2000a; Logan et al. 1996).

Black Americans are the only groups penalized for owning a home and the only group to receive negative returns on their educational attainment after a certain level. Black homeowners reside in neighborhoods that are more segregated and less affluent than their renting counterparts (Alba et al 2000). Additionally, they are more likely to live in suburban areas that are adjacent to lower-income areas and in general, had a socioeconomic status that was fragile at best (Patillo 1999). Thus in general, the experiences of Latino/as and Asians (slightly dependent upon nation of origin—see earlier comments) are largely consistent with the spatial assimilation model while Blacks

(and Black Latino/as; see Massey and Denton 1987) do not see the same payoff for improved socioeconomic status. The major drawback of this theory is of course its lack of explanatory power to the experience of the Black middle class and their negative returns on various attainment outcomes. This could pose potential limitations for fully understanding the experiences of Black-multiracial groups.

### *Segregation Relationships*

Spatial Assimilation theory is relatively silent when it comes to the residential patterns of mixed-race groups. Massey and Denton (1987) provide one of the only studies of this kind in which they distinguish among White, Black and mixed-race Latino/as. They find that Black and mixed-race Latino/as' residential patterns mirror those of African Americans. Aside from this study, spatial assimilation theorists are silent when it comes to the residential patterns of mixed-race groups. However, there are some things to consider with the overall multiracial population that make this theoretical perspective useful when understanding their spatial patterns. Recent studies show that those who identify as multiracial are generally of middle to upper-middle class standing (Korgen 2010). Aside from these findings, very little is known about the socioeconomic status of multiracials. Given that a large proportion of the multiracial population is under the age of thirty, one may question the utility of this perspective for the issue at hand. However, when looking to other groups, none of the research on Asian, Black, Latino/a or White segregation implicates that age structures of specific populations shape segregation between groups in a noticeable way. In Chapter 5, there will be a detailed overview of some descriptive statistics surrounding individual-level

characteristics that are of primary concern of this perspective. Given the different patterns we would expect the subgroups in the multiracial population that have socioeconomic characteristics closer to Whites will in fact live closer to Whites (e.g. poorer multiracial groups will live closer to their single-race counterpart). This is the same for other nonWhite groups who share similar socioeconomic characteristics with Whites will live closer to Whites and to each other.

Despite insights derived from traditional perspectives on assimilation that have been critiqued heavily in race and ethnicity, spatial assimilation may prove useful for interpreting the segregation of mixed-race groups as a more targeted focus for such an exploratory study or for a group whose patterns are not well established. It is the hope in this study that findings regarding the residential segregation of mixed-race groups will provide some insight into the larger debate over the classic, segmented and spatial assimilation perspectives to address the changing racial landscape and this emerging population.

### *Place Stratification*

This perspective draws attention to the barriers to residential mobility faced by members of minority groups. It states that racial and ethnic minorities are sorted by place according to their group's relative standing in society, limiting the ability of even the socially mobile members to reside in the same communities as comparable Whites (Alba and Logan 1993; Massey and Denton 1993; Charles 2003). This perspective brings attention to the residential experiences of Black Americans. Some of the challenges of the spatial assimilation perspective led to the development of an alternative perspective.

Much like the *stratification economics* (Darity 2005) perspective in economics, place stratification centralizes the racial identity of a group in the larger structure as the primary means of group differentiation in residential outcomes. Moreover, place stratification emphasizes the power of White actors as main contributors to uneven residential patterns.

Accordingly, this perspective posits, Whites use segregation to maintain social distance, and therefore, contemporary residential segregation, particularly segregation between Black and Whites, is best understood as originating from structural forces tied to racial prejudice and discrimination that preserve Whites' place in the social hierarchy and the advantages that come with that social position (Wacquant and Wilson 1989; Logan et al. 1996; Massey and Denton 1993). Due to the persistence of racially separate neighborhoods, despite advances in antidiscrimination legislation, scholars began to examine segregation as a combination of individual and institutional-level actions.

Scholars generally agree that all levels of government, as well as the real estate, lending, and construction industries, played critical roles in creating and maintaining a dual housing market that constrained the mobility options of Blacks (Massey and Denton 1993; Yinger 1995). Research regarding the discriminatory practices of real estate agents (Yinger 1993, 1998), local governments and mortgage lenders (Squires and Kim 1995) and differential access to resources throughout the housing search (Clark, 2009; Krysan, 2008) are advanced as contributing factors to the creation of a racially segmented housing market that obstructs the mobility aspirations of minorities. Some of the most notably studies in this vein are the audit studies (Turner et al 2002).

Since the mid-1950s, audit studies have proven useful in detecting these subtle forms of discrimination within the housing market and throughout the housing search. In an audit study, pairs of trained testers—one White and the other either Black or Hispanic—with similar economic and family characteristics inquire about housing, and record their experiences with the real estate agents or landlords. Depending upon the type of audit, housing units are sampled randomly and all interactions from cold calls to agents or landlords to potential acts of racial steering are recorded. A survey of these audit studies finds evidence that there has not been a meaningful change in discriminatory practices over time in the search for housing (Yinger 1995, 1998). Yet, audit studies are not without their critics (Butters 1993; Heckman and Siegelman 1993).

Much of the criticism comes from the methodological design, which can lend to underestimating or overstating the frequency of discrimination. For example, these estimations depend upon the sample selection, which often lacks blind sampling—as part of the training process, auditors are fully informed of the purpose of the study and as a result may be unintentionally motivated to “find” discrimination. Additionally, characteristics of the auditor (facial hair) may impact interaction with the agents and/or influence the report of findings in general. The use of gross measures of discrimination (record of all errors made by agents and landlords) may allow inaccurate assumptions, which confound random and systematic effects of “race-neutral” errors. Put another way, critics argue that this assumes that firms never make race-neutral errors such that all errors are viewed as unfavorable or discriminatory treatment, inflating systematic effects. Questions about the overall generalizability of the findings are raised given the

studies are generally measuring discrimination in a segment of the housing market (units advertised in major newspapers, for example).

However, Massey and Lundy (2001) argue that racial discrimination in the housing market need not involve personal contact between agents and auditors. Using research that indicates Americans can infer race from speech patterns, the authors designed an audit study to document if Black male and female participants experienced racial discrimination over the phone by rental agents. The authors found that class and gender often exacerbated racial discrimination such that poor Black women in particular, experienced the greatest discrimination. Yinger asserts that the audit studies are valuable and finds that in every phase of the housing search process, minority auditors disproportionality experience differential treatment compared to their White counterparts which in most cases, comes with a hefty price tag.

For example, Yinger (1995) estimates that every time that Black and Hispanic households search for housing—whether they encounter discrimination or not—they pay a “discrimination tax” of approximately \$3,000. Cumulatively, he estimates that Blacks and Hispanics pay \$4.1 billion per year in higher search costs and lost housing opportunities. Included in this estimate is the decision of ten percent of Blacks and 15 percent of Hispanics not to look for housing because they anticipate discrimination (Charles 2003). By making it more difficult for minorities to purchase housing, discrimination contributes to racial disparities in homeownership and the accumulation of wealth, which in turn contributes to persisting patterns of residential segregation.

Accordingly, the place stratification model implies several hypotheses regarding racial and ethnic differences in the attainment of spatial proximity to the White majority. First, by highlighting the unwillingness of Whites to share neighborhoods with minority residents, the place stratification model suggests that Whites will be more likely than members of minority groups to move into neighborhoods with large White populations, and that Whites will especially avoid neighborhoods with large Black populations (Krysan 2002). White stereotyping of, and hostility towards, minorities may also impede minorities' migration into mixed or predominantly White neighborhoods (Krysan and Farley 2002). The place stratification model describes how members of powerful groups manipulate space to maintain their physical and social separation from groups they view as undesirable.

A variation of this first hypothesis is the concept of "preferences" in the housing market which has its own body of scholarship (Clark 1992; St. John and Clark 1984; Fossett and Cready 1998; Glazer 1999; Grief 2009; Krysan and Farley 2002; Krysan et al 2009; Schelling 1971) both supporting and refuting the assumption that preferences impact residential segregation. The in-group preference hypothesis argues that all groups have "strong desires" for neighborhoods with substantial numbers of co-ethnics (Clark 1992) that reflect a sort of natural ethnocentrism rather than hostility toward non-group members or an effort to preserve relative status advantages. While studies show that all racial groups held a preference for both meaningful integration and a presence of same-race neighbors, Whites exhibited the strongest preference for same-race neighbors but



also remained the most desirable out-group for other groups (Clark 2009; Farley et al 1997).

However, the overall conclusion to be drawn is that active racial prejudice is a critical component of preferences for integration, and therefore, the persistence of racially segregated communities. In particular, Whites' racial prejudice is a double perpetrator—influential not only for its effect on their own integration attitudes, but also for its implications for minority group preferences and residential search behavior. Areas perceived as hostile toward particular minority groups are also perceived as less attractive, even when other aspects of the communities should be desirable (Charles 2003). Indeed, Blacks openly admit that fears of White hostility motivate desires for more than a handful of “co-ethnic” neighbors (Krysan and Farley 2002). Although the influence of racial stereotyping is present for all groups, nonWhite groups want substantially more integration than do Whites.

Second, with its emphasis on the unique disadvantages suffered by Blacks (Massey and Denton 1993), the place stratification model posits that Blacks are less able than Latinos and Asians to attain spatial proximity with the White majority, even after adjusting for group differences in the established socioeconomic, demographic and geographic determinants of inter-neighborhood migration. Alternative explanations by way of the racial proxy (Clark 1986, 1988; Harris 2001) and the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypotheses (Ellen 2000) argue that persistent anti-Black co-residence by out-group members is attributed to a collection of undesirable social class characteristics associated with Blacks or the neighborhoods where they are concentrated

(joblessness, welfare dependence, an excess of criminal behavior). Thus the argument is not race per se, that motivates an aversion to Black neighbors (not only among out-groups, but among Blacks themselves) but strong stereotypes of “Black” neighborhoods.

While these perspectives provide an alternative explanation, race is ultimately still at the center of the explanation and remains a central feature to the explanation for the residential experiences for minorities and Blacks in particular. Although housing discrimination against Latino/as, and Whites’ stated desire to avoid living near Latino/as is not insignificant, this perspective posits that these levels generally fall below those experienced by Blacks.

Third, the place stratification model implies differences among racial and ethnic groups in the effects of socioeconomic characteristics on their spatial proximity to Whites. Logan and Alba (1993) propose two versions of the place stratification model that speak to such differences. In the “strong” version, minorities receive lower locational returns than the White majority to their human capital and other material gains, largely because housing discrimination prevents minorities from successfully converting their resources into desirable neighborhood amenities. Conversely, in the “weak” version of the place stratification model, it costs minorities more than the majority to enter predominantly White neighborhoods, and hence the effects of socioeconomic characteristics are stronger among minorities. At the same time, however, as in the theory’s strong version, minority group members never attain the level of neighborhood resources enjoyed by comparable majority-group members. Thus, in one way or another, and to a greater or lesser degree, discrimination in the housing

market constrains the ability of non/Whites to rent and/or purchase housing, and/or received the same returns on their investment as their White counterparts.

### *Segregation Relationships*

The segregation relationships are expected to follow similar suit to that of spatial assimilation but for different reasons. Although these theories seem to be competing, they actually work together to explain the many dimensions to residential segregation. The explanations for segregation are best understood as stemming from structural forces tied to racial prejudice and discrimination that preserve the relative status advantages of Whites. Some alternative explanations highlight the role of preference and racially based attitudes and perceptions. However race and perceived racial position in society are central features to the place stratification perspective. Thus this perspective combines social class characteristics with the racialization and racial project theses to understand differential group outcomes.

Omi and Winant (1994) describe racialization as the “extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice, or group” (pp. 55). Although processes of racialization are always embedded in other forms of hierarchy, they acquire autonomy and have independent social effects. The racialization of people along with other social indicators such as class or gender generates new forms of human association with definite status differences. Although racial categories are socially constructed, once the process of attaching meaning to a group is instituted, race becomes a real category of groups association and identity. The racial group placed in the superior position tends to receive greater economic rewards, in this case superior housing stock,

and access to other opportunities (more competitive lending rates, familial monetary assistance with down-payments) to remain in an advantaged social position.

Closely related to the racialization process is the concept of *racial projects*. These projects are the historically situated, ideological link between racial structures and racial representation. Racial projects are used to frame situations in order to reorganize the distribution of resources such as racial proxy arguments outlined previously. A connection to resources is important as Bonilla-Silva (1997) contends the distribution of resources is what defines the racial hierarchy. The place stratification perspective pushes beyond social class characteristics to incorporate the centrality of race in stratified outcomes such as those found in the housing market.

Thus for self-identified, mixed-race groups such as multiracials, their social position in this type of hierarchy remains highly contested given that their racialization process may be more reflective of their particular racial composition rather than their larger designation as “multiracial.” Therefore their residential patterns could in fact reflect multiple racialized processes, some contradictory and some not. The place stratification perspective is silent on the residential patterns of multiracial groups; however, we can potentially expect a gradation of outcomes for specific multiracial groups such that Asian-White multiracials will live the closest to Whites but Black-Asians will experience the most segregation from Whites. If in fact, dual minority status and/or Black multiracial subgroups within the multiracial population experience different patterns of segregation from non-Black multiracials, the place stratification perspective can aid in the explanation of these residential patterns.

### *Eclectic Group Differences Perspective*

While race and ethnic identification are proven to impact the social mobility of a group, there may be other factors to contribute to social stratification and impaired mobility. Combining demography and socio-historic context, Jiobu (1988, 1990) presents an argument for the examination of other domains outside of race and ethnicity where groups can differ on social characteristics that in turn can promote segregation. The characteristics of groups in their particular settings can have implications for their ultimate place in the ethnic hierarchy. While racial and ethnic demography has an influence on racial inequality, socioeconomic stratification, and residential segregation, it varies with demographic characteristics—there are aspects of ethnic relations that are dictated by demography.

Jiobu claims certain features of a group's demography predispose the group toward socioeconomic achievements greatly impacting their residential opportunities and potential for assimilation (Jiobu 1990). Often this perspective is viewed as falling between demography and ethnic relations as it deals with the impact of demographic dimensions on socioeconomic attainment. Certain population characteristics (size of group, location, age and sex composition, family structure, fertility) affect ethnic group attainment. To an important degree, the success or failure of the generation as a whole can be attributed to the demographic potential of the cohort. Here, "the unit of analysis becomes the ethnic group rather than the cohort; focus is restricted to a few demographic dimensions rather than a host of causes and consequences; and comparisons are made across groups rather than across time" (Jiobu 1990:117). Focusing on the specific group

characteristics, in conjunction with the infrastructure in which it is engaging, allows for the combination of demographic potential and the uniqueness of the group profile to make predictions for socioeconomic attainment and ultimately residential group patterns. This perspective posits that race plays a different feature in the lives of each racial group thus racial gaps are caused by special institutional forces and advantages from some groups, obstacles that existed for some groups that did not exist for another, and heritages of oppression that resulted in vastly different structures of situations.

This perspective redirects the focus of inter-group inequality for the prejudice and discrimination standpoint to assess the potential of other factors that contribute to group inequality. The premise of this theory is derived from the debates of the 20<sup>th</sup> century of two diverging paths characterized as the “problem minority” and “ethnic exceptionalism.” The *problem minority thesis* states a group that is subjected to persistent, systematic, and intense discrimination will eventually become a problem in greater society. This argument is set to explain the experiences of Black Americans, Mexican Americans, Native Americans and many other groups in the U.S. and elsewhere. In essence, it is what Gunnar Myrdal (1964) described as the process of *cumulative causation*, which was most commonly cited as the sociological explanation for the failure of minority groups to achieve middle class standing. It is the cyclical nature of discrimination by the majority on the minority that keeps them in a state of dominator and subordinate, reinforcing these roles and reaching a point of equilibrium. The equilibrium is not exactly stable however. Change in either group will trigger a new cycle of mutual cause and effect, moving the system toward a new equilibrium.

Conversely, *ethnic exceptionalism* seeks to explain a group, which has, for various reasons, managed to escape a “downward spiral” and further has achieved significant upward mobility—notably some Asian American groups. The perspective at hand seeks to describe why some groups are caught in the cycle of cumulative causation and why others experience ethnic exceptionalism. Within these dichotomous frames there are three major assumptions: 1) the majority imposes its stratification system on the minority, 2) if the first assumption is correct the socioeconomic structures of the minority must resemble the majority’s, 3) “more is higher” –the more status attainment the higher the social position. Closely related to this assumption is the “higher is the more powerful”. The higher the socioeconomic status of the group, the more power it has in the sense of influence and control over its own destiny. With racism as a factor in the larger infrastructure, Jiobu seeks to take a step further to understand additional factors and how they may be impacting these differences in outcomes for groups that experience discrimination yet receiving different outcomes. This led to the examination of an alternative dialogue regarding the positionality of dominate and subordinate groups.

The guiding assumption is that the upward mobility of an ethnic group is determined by its infrastructure as well as the infrastructure of the situation it encounters. In demographic terms, the potential of a groups’ demography predisposes the group toward socioeconomic achievements such that the *demographic potential* of a group results from all the demographic forces acting upon it in concert. This concept of *demographic potential* is not new to demography and asserts that certain population’s

characteristics affect ethnic group attainment (Lieberson 1980). However, Jiobu argues the concept makes no mention of specific variables. Those must be identified within the context of a given research situation. Once identified however, the concept does not require that variables have the same impact on all ethnic groups under investigation. Furthermore, Jiobu states that just because a group is demographically favored does not mean the group will necessarily succeed, nor does it mean that an un-favored group will always fail. The concept in no way precludes individual characteristics and larger social entities (policy). The concept only asserts that demographic forces play an important role, one, which has not been sufficiently emphasized in the past.

The main implication of Jiobu's framework is that if groups were similar on these various domains where groups can differ on social characteristics then segregation will be reduced—if this is the case race and ethnicity (or prejudice and discrimination) are much more complicated effects and do not tell the entire story. He is aware that race and ethnicity can lead to segregation either by discrimination or congregation but invites us to think about other factors. These factors in his work, listed previously, are population factors used to understand why various native-born and foreign-born racial minority groups experienced different outcomes (assimilation trajectories). Given the multiracial population is distinctively different from larger pan-ethnic immigrant groups, group modifications to variables included and expectations of this theory are to be made. First, multiracials do not differ drastically on many of the social characteristics outlined in Jiobu's previous work. However, multiracials have slightly higher educational attainment and income than some of their single-race counterparts (Korgen 2010). Yet,



the key population characteristics of interest in this research are characteristics that are particular to the multiracial population: the impact of population size, the on average significantly younger population as well as their concentration in specific regions. These characteristics of the multiracial population define their demographic profile thus potentially impacting their demographic potential. Joibu is making a sociodemographic group composition argument, which contrasts to the racial argument outlined, in previous perspectives. He is aggregating similarities as a means for group dynamics, advancing the notion that similarity on any dimension helps and similarity on many dimensions is better (Fossett and Cready 1998). Considering many of the domains outlined in his previous work are fairly similar for the multiracial population and their single-race counterparts, group size, age, and regional concentration will be emphasized in this study.

The Jiobuiangroup *differences perspective* in a certain respect harkens back to classic social distance theories in that group characteristics and similarities are what keeps groups together or apart. Competition is particularly of interest when discussing residential segregation and has a long history of being a determining mechanism for residential patterns (Park et al 1925; Duncan and Duncan 1955; Lieberman 1980; Jargowsky 1997). Namely, group size or perceived group size as a demographic variable is one of the most notable factors contributing to differential outcomes for racial and ethnic minority groups. When competition is higher it impacts group opportunity and is often dictated by group size (Creedy and Fossett 1998). Thus when a group begins to grow larger, it impacts the dominant groups' ability to reside in areas predominately

theirs or to a lesser extend, reduces their ability to remain distant from those who have not achieved a certain standard of assimilation (Jimenez 2010, Lieberman 1980). In this respect, patterns of consistent growth spurred by continuous immigration can impact a group's ability to gain residential attainment with the dominant group (which is viewed as desirable and the end goal in the classic theories of social distance and competition).

A similar argument based on demographic characteristics as means to explain differential outcomes for subjugated groups is made by Lieberman (1980) as he explains the differences between Asian and Black trajectories in the U.S. Both groups are phenotypically distinct from Whites and experienced severe animosity by Whites; however they had drastically different outcomes. He claims that the country's history with Asian Americans in the 1860's was one of very aggressive discrimination, which was written out in law, ultimately leading to the Chinese Exclusion Act, the Gentlemen's Agreement and a quota system which excluded them altogether (see previous section on Asian multiracials for details). Asians are phenotypically distinct from Whites so they were not able to pass and in many cases, were ineligible to receive citizenship (Haney Lopez 2006) and yet they have a different set of outcomes in the contemporary era. Lieberman (1980) essentially points to one thing—forced size reduction. Animosity towards Asians was so great that those in power were able, through policy, to cut off a sizable portion of the population through restrictions on immigration. Lieberman (1980) argues that only after decades of cultural assimilation where Asians are no longer culturally distinct, and therefore no longer a threat to Whites. Asian Americans constitute a very small population in residential areas (with only a handful of exceptions

in cities across the nation) and thus were not being treated as badly by Whites because they no longer posed a sizable threat. This is also regionally relevant as he explains the Japanese were interned en masse on the west coast, though that was not the case on the east coast. Again, this emphasizes that demographic outcomes are subject to the infrastructure in which groups encounter. Spatial characteristics are a part of this infrastructure, impacting group outcomes. As previous research shows, the multiracial population is concentrated in the west and the south and so this perspective would expect the residential outcomes of multiracials to differ by region based on these spatial characteristics. While Lieberman's (1980) explanations may be an overgeneralization, it reflects how racial animosity can be viewed as conditioned by the other factors, such as size of the population. Whites may never have liked Asians, they never had low social distance from Asians but other conditions change such that Whites no longer organize in the same way that they organized against Blacks.

This is not to overlook the fact that race plays a different feature in the lives of Blacks than any other non-White groups, which again relates to differing outcomes. However Jibou (1988) contends that racial gaps are caused by special institutional forces and advantages for some groups (the heritage of slavery and its damaging effects, and obstacles that did not exist for other non-White groups) that create a vastly different structure of situations. He contends Black Americans are unable to disassociate themselves from the derogatory notions about them and the negative dispositions toward Blacks, which go back to the slave era. Changes in immigration policy changed the face

of non-White minorities in the U.S. allowing more time to develop special mobility niches, becoming less of a symbolic(as opposed to actual) threat to Whites.

Additionally, Blalock (1967) contends that group dynamics may not be as decisive when groups are small so they have more options than larger groups. Multiracials are a smaller group and using Jiobu's(1990) framework, we can assess how multiracials move through the residential market. As a group their size does not pose a threat to Whites, thus may not impact their residential opportunities negatively. However, I will examine non-White segregation patterns as well and so although small, other minority groups may have animosity toward this smaller group or see them as competing for similar resources and characterized as not "full" members of a racial group. Their relative group size would either support or debunk the idea that group characteristics in terms of culture or demography compounds the impact of race and ethnicity and racial identity. Racial animosity is at the forefront in hegemonic structures, however it may be conditioned by other factors.

Jiobu(1990) recognizes it is possible to maintain the notion that racial animosity is the most important thing out of all of the variables but it is not the only thing. Thus if there is a group that is relatively small, and theoretically non-threatening to Whites, is it possible that Whites could have high animosity to them but not be aggressive with regard to avoiding residential contact? Herein lies the predictive power of this argument and this perspective for the purpose of this study. If there are differing demographic characteristics such as size, will this group find itself less segregated from their single-race counterparts? It is yet to be understood if multiracials pose a conflict for other

groups in the housing market and this perspective is one way to understand that dynamic.

### *Segregation Relationship*

Based on previous research, the demographic composition of the mixed-race groups in the analysis are relatively smaller than their larger single-race counterparts and are generally middle to upper middle class. However the multiracial group does differ from single-race groups in their size, youth, and regional variation. These differences would then result in different residential patterns from their single-race counterparts. For example, we may expect Black-White multiracials to live closer to Whites than their Black counterparts, but closer to Whites than their Black counterparts. Overall, the multiracial population as a whole is a smaller population and thus we can anticipate less conflict from any of the single-race groups, resulting in less competition and more access to residential opportunities that evade their single-race counterparts. They may have more opportunities to reside in a variety of neighborhoods than their single-race counterparts.

In addition, the multiracial group is uniquely diverse in comparison to larger pan-ethnic groups. A multiracial identity can reflect a wide-range of racial pairings and compositions. These varied pairings result in a different structure of situations for each multiracial group, hence the anticipation of different residential outcomes among multiracial subgroups.

### **A Review**

Based on the review of the theoretical perspectives in the previous section, we

can summarize the implications of these perspectives in the following chart. This is a useful guide rather than predictions that are overly precise. I am intentionally using very broad terms like high, med, and low. However, while any cell in the table is open to discussion, an overarching point is that the perspectives lead to a range of views about what is plausible regarding the segregation of these group comparisons. And so I view my task as assembling the data and looking at relevant indicators to determine what the patterns are. I will then compare the results against the general broad implications of the perspectives as laid out by Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 Segregation Relationships and Theoretical Perspectives**

Segregation Relationships	White/ Non-White	Black/ Non-Black	Latin Americanization Thesis	Spatial Assimilation	Place Stratification	Eclectic Group Differences Perspective
W—B	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI
W—BW	HI	HI	MED	MED	MED	LOW
W—A	HI	LOW	MED	LOW	LOW	LOW
W—AW	HI	LOW	MED	LOW	LOW	LOW
A—AW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW
A—B	LOW	HI	MED	HI	HI	HI
A—BA	LOW	HI	LOW	MED	MED	LOW
B—BW	LOW	HI	MED	MED	MED	LOW
B—BA	LOW	LOW	MED	MED	MED	LOW

W: Non-Hispanic White

B: Non-Hispanic Black

A: Non-Hispanic Asian

BW: Non-Hispanic Black /White Biracial (only)

AW: Non-Hispanic Asian/White(only)

BA: Non-Hispanic Black /Asian (only)

In viewing the table, we can see that all of the perspectives anticipate that Black-White segregation will be high and Asian-Asian/White segregation will be low; however, those are the only similarities that all perspectives share. The Binary

perspectives (White/Non-White and Black/Non-Black) and the Eclectic Group Differences perspective reflect the most polarizing views on segregation amongst groups. They offer no moderate levels of segregation for group comparisons reflecting a rigid notion of a Black-Whiteline. The LAT shows different expectation from all other theoretical frameworks in the analysis. This perspective anticipates that the majority of the group comparisons in the analysis will experience moderate levels of segregation. This is reflective of the anticipated position in the *honorary White* category for the majority of groups in this analysis. As Bonilla-Silva (2004) argues, groups in the honorary White category are the buffer between the White and collective Black category, thus we would expect them to be moderately segregated from each group. This is a different approach to the binary perspective that lacks a middle ground.

Theories in residential segregation do not address multiracials directly but rather socioeconomic characteristics and discrimination experienced by racial groups. As stated in the discussion and seen here in the table, these perspectives hold identical predictions but for different reasons. Spatial Assimilation views segregation patterns in terms of status attainment and mobility. Conversely, Place Stratification understands these spatial patterns as the result of discrimination in the housing market and other institutions that impact status attainment and mobility. Thus, Spatial Assimilation and Place Stratification involve processes that are intertwined but amplify different points in these processes. However, the outcomes are similar, resulting in identical predictions.

Lastly, the Eclectic Group Differences perspective anticipates that the smaller size, youthfulness, and regional concentration of the multiracial population will impact

their opportunities for residential integration with the larger pan-ethnic groups. Due to their smaller size and youth, multiracials are not competition for single-race groups in the housing market. This results in more opportunity and less residential constraints for each group. Multiracial groups are not expected to experience high levels of segregation from any group but instead will experience lower segregation from most groups. This is the only theory that has a mechanism for the potential variation over place. It takes into account the infrastructure in which groups are situated as well as variables that can be interchangeable to reflect group differences. While it may be a roundabout way to address place variation, it allows for such spatial differences to be taken into account when discussing differential outcomes. Consequently, this perspective would expect that in the places in which multiracials are concentrated such as the west, they would experience higher levels of segregation from their parent groups. This results into a push toward more diverse neighborhoods in which neither group is residentially prominent or potential segregation from one of their parent groups and close proximity to the other.

While each of these perspectives offers a range of predictions, all but one of these perspectives specify similar or different mechanisms of change or stability in these patterns across spatial areas. These perspectives are silent on whether these predictions are held in all places at all times. Therefore, these perspectives anticipate that segregation is patterned the same in Portland as in Detroit. Or, in the case of Spatial Assimilation, poorer Blacks will experience the same levels of segregation across cities. According to the binary perspectives, what it means to be Black or White is the same across cities. Therefore Blacks and Whites will experience segregation in the same way



across cities. The LAT does discuss the potential for honorary Whites to move into the White category; however there is no clear discussion of how that process may occur and the actions that must happen to lead to that shift. Yet, the LAT does not address the impact of their social position across different racial contexts, such as the city. There is evidence that spatial context impacts social process (Abu-Lughod 2007; Duncan and Duncan 2003; Grazian 2004; Jackson 2001). For example, places that are known as immigrant gateways are expected to have more diversity, such as Miami, than in cities with a long history of Black-White segregation such as Chicago. Each of these contexts shape the race relations within, therefore we may anticipate segregation patterns to be impacted as well. Conversely, these theories provide no direction to guide our understanding of how these patterns remain the same, change over time, or vary across different contexts.

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA AND METHODS: AN INTERVENTION

#### **Hypotheses, Research Design and Plan of Analysis**

In the previous chapter, I outlined anticipated residential outcomes for each theoretical perspective. The perspectives lead to a wide range of views about what is plausible. I view my task as assembling the data and looking at relevant indicators to determine what each perspectives as laid out, has to say about the patterns that are found throughout the analysis. The purpose of this chapter is to outline the general hypotheses summarized in the previous chapter and present the research design and plan of analysis to tackle these claims.

#### *Hypotheses*

Taking these previous literature and theoretical perspectives into consideration, here are general hypotheses for the segregation outcomes of each multiracial group:

- $H_1$  = Black/White multiracial individuals will hold an intermediary space between Whites and Blacks, experiencing similar levels of contact with blacks and Whites.
- $H_2$  = Asian/White multiracial individuals will have more contact with Whites than any other multiracial group.
- $H_3$  = Black/Asian multiracial individuals will experience the highest levels of segregation from Asians and Whites than other multiracial groups but will live in more diverse neighborhoods than all other multiracial groups.
- $H_4$  = All multiracial groups will live in more diverse neighborhoods than their single-race counterparts.
- $H_5$  = These patterns will not vary by city or region.

In sum, these perspectives anticipate multiracial segregation to reflect slightly different outcomes for each subgroup based on racial composition of the multiracial group

however all groups will live in more diverse neighborhoods than their single-race counterpart. Neither perspectives nor previous research systematically address variation across place. Therefore it is not expected that these patterns will vary by city and/or region. The findings in this study are anticipated to have implications for theoretical standpoints on U.S. race relations and racial hierarchy, outlined in the previous section. This study will investigate residential patterns that are relatively unknown while advancing current methods in order to study populations that were virtually impossible to study before this advancement.

### *Research Design*

The research design for this study is tailored to answer the descriptive questions about the levels and differences of segregation over different group comparisons and how this varies across cities in the U.S. This is be addressed by developing appropriate summary measures of different aspects of segregation and performing descriptive quantitative analyses of how variation across cities is structured regionally. Since the cities in this study are selected based on a specific criterion, they are mostly big cities that are generally more diverse. Thus attempting a statistical analysis of variation for size and proportion minority would not offer much. Thus variation across region, which is a proxy for things like proportion minority population, is the only variable assessed for variation. Finally, a review of individual cities is used to provide more insight into the patterns beneath the summary statistics. Below are descriptions of each section in the plan of analysis.

### *Overview of Socioeconomic Characteristics*

An overview of the demographic and economic characteristics of the multiracial population is presented in comparison to single-race populations in the analysis. Select sociodemographic characteristics are identified using micro level data from the most recent 5-year, *American Community Survey*. Tables are used to discuss descriptive differences amongst groups as social indicators for potential patterns of segregation. This approach takes into account the sociodemographic differences as it pertains to residential outcomes required in perspectives specific to residential segregation. Due to small counts, local differences cannot be acquired for all of the cities in the analysis. Yet, the micro-data will be used to inform our thinking of what may be going on beneath the surface. Thus more detailed group comparisons at the national level are investigated. This aggregate level analysis will allow for inferences made at the individual level and across cities.

### *Summary of Segregation Patterns*

In measuring patterns of contact with majority and minority groups, measures of exposure and contact are utilized to understand overall contact with all groups in a spatial unit. Contact patterns are expected to be highest with Whites for multiracial groups but still maintaining contact with other groups in the city. Multiracials are anticipated to live in more diverse neighborhoods than their single-race counterparts. Residential segregation is also measured with a proportion- neighborhood-White index and a diversity index. Findings from this index will show the types of neighborhoods multiracial persons reside.

In addition, measures of uneven distribution are assessed to measure segregation between each multiracial group and its parent group. Outcomes are expected to differ based on racial composition of each multiracial group. Outcomes are also expected to differ by select measures of uneven distribution. The scores of each measure are compared as a methodological exercise to address the limitations in traditional measures of unevenness. A new methodological intervention is presented as optimal for studies of residential segregation when one of the comparison groups is exponentially smaller than the other.

#### *Patterns Over CBSAs*

I obtain these segregation scores for different groups comparisons for a range of cities. I examine a variety of group comparisons and variations across groups. I assess how the range of the variation across groups varies across cities. These data are divided into three levels of analysis. The first are simply summary statistics for the varied measures of residential segregation listed above. Next a comprehensive list of all cities that met a particular selection criterion for each multiracial group is presented. The second level of analysis occurs with a subset of cities selected as exemplars of city type or pattern. Detailed segregation scores, contact scores, neighborhood diversity indices and proportion-neighborhood-White-scores, and population parameters are outlined for each city. These cities highlight patterns of contrast but are also consistent with the statistical summaries that are presented by the full list of cities. This smaller group provides examples of various prototype cities in the analysis drawing attention to larger patterns found in the full list of cities in the analysis. They offer a point of reference

during the discussion of segregation scores and spatial patterns. Given the amount of data presented for each group and each city, this tier level analysis offers a manageable way to present that data by maintaining a sense of familiarity with select cities. This tri-level process will be used to examine the residential patterns for all three multiracial groups.

### **Population Groups Examined**

The population groups selected for this study are a combination of self-selected, single-race, pan-ethnic groups and three multiracial groups outlined in Table 4.1. These groups are coded based on census tabulations for each single-race and multi-race group. As discussed in detail in previous chapters, these three multiracial groups were selected based on their size as well as their deviation from traditional studies on multiracial persons.

**Table 4.1 Population Group Examined**

<b>Pan-Ethnic Groups</b>	<b>Multiracial Group</b>
White (W)	Black/White Multiracial (BW)
Black (B)	Asian/White Multiracial (AW)
Asian (A)	Black/Asian Multiracial (BA)
*Latino/a (H)	

\*All Latinos, regardless of racial distinction are recognized in this group  
All groups are non-Hispanic except for Latino group

The larger single-race, pan-ethnic groups are used as comparison groups when assessing specific measures of segregation as well as assessing various dynamics

between neighborhood diversity and overall ethnic composition of the spatial units and community units selected for this study. An example of the comparisons to be examined is as follows: for Black-White (BW) multiracials I assess the segregation patterns between *Whites (W) and Blacks (B)*, *between Whites (W) and Black-White (BW) multiracials*, and *Black (B) Black-White (BW) multiracial scores*. These types of comparisons will be made for each multiracial group. All groups are coded as non-Hispanic except for the Latino/a population, which is coded as all single-race groups that designated a Latino/a identity on the U.S. Census. Thus I am treating Latinos/as as a racial group in this analysis (Frank et al 2010; Jimenez 2010). In the *Data and Methods* section, I outline the main reasons why Latino/a multiracial persons are not included in this analysis; however, the Latino/a population is included in measures of overall ethnic composition as well as neighborhood level racial composition (Charles 2006).

This study will examine the segregation of adults only. I am primarily concerned with adults due to the fact that segregation is reflected in housing decisions and constraints, in which children and adults locate through different processes. Namely, children are not the primary decision maker in the housing process and thus go wherever their caretaker goes. Multiracial children present a different dynamic than adults. For example, while the household may be multiracial, there is a high probability that the parents are not multiracial but an interracial couple (Farley 2002). Interracial couples are a different population with potentially different constraints in the housing market that are not under investigation in this study. Additionally, parents of interracial children may be

seeking out acceptance for their child or other things that may not be of high concern for multiracial adults.

Based on an initial investigation, the residential patterns of adults may be easier to theorize given their centrality to the decision making in the housing market. Lastly, adults are the individuals who fill out the census form. These adults who have selected two or more racial identifiers are displaying some form of salience to a multiracial identity that was not selected for them by their parent/guardian (Rockquemore and Brunnsma 2008).

#### *A Note on the Census Race Categories and Multiracial Identity*

Scholars concerned with the study of multiracial identity and categorization have mentioned the fluidity of identity amongst the multiracial population as a potential point of contention for the study of this population (Khanna 2004, 2010; Rockquemore and Brunnsma 2001; Harris and Sims 2002; Doyle and Kao 2007). Thus the question becomes, can we trust these data on multiracial identity as reliable when examining the multiracial population (Campbell 2007, 2010)? This question is not uncommon in multiracial literature (Brunnsma 2006a) but can be critiqued as being limited in scope. Yet, it is important to address these concerns as it relates to this study. Yes, there is strong evidence that multiracial identity is fluid but much of what we know about the fluidity for multiracial people comes from the study of adolescents (Harris and Sims 2002; Root 1992). We have every reason to believe that adolescents are going through a lot of identity processes that should stabilize later in life. The high estimates and reported “chaos” with change in the identity of multiracial respondents (Harris and Sims



2002; Harris 2002; Doyle and Kao 2007) will probably slow down when these people get married, have kids and stabilize how they racially see themselves in the social world. This is not to say there is not fluidity amongst adults, but we have every reason to believe that it would be less.

Secondly, this concern of fluidity discounts the fluidity in other identities (e.g. social class) and for other racial groups (Lacy 2007). Saperstien's (2006, 2012) work shows that there are changes in identity for single-race persons and these changes are meaningful. Furthermore, this change is not random change; this is change that maps onto inequality differences. Thus, while people change their identities over time, this does not mean they are not experiencing the consequences of those identities at that time (Campbell and Herman 2010). The racial identities we select are meaningful and they are not random (Harris and Sims 2002; Roquequemoire and Brunsma 2008). Overall, with a chosen identity, we are making claims as to membership in a community so we would expect that to affect things like where people live. Therefore, it is appropriate to trust the selection of a multiracial identity by respondents in the groups selected for this study, as something that is meaningful to them and trustworthy for this line of investigation. Researchers who have examined residential segregation using similar groups as the ones in this study, at the household and individual level have used these categories (Bennett 2011; Holloway et al 2010).

## **Data and Methods**

### *Data Sources*

#### *U.S. Census*

The data in this study will come from the Summary File 1 (SF1) of the 2010 U.S. Census. The SF1 is a good data source for examining social groups that are small because it provides 100 percent population counts at the block, block group and tract levels. Given that the multiracial population is less than 10 percent of the U.S. population, other large-scale surveys provide only samples of this small population creating problems for measures and overall reliability of the data. Secondly, when one begins to slice this population into smaller subgroups, the numbers become critically small. In addition, the structuring of the race questions allows for the separation of persons into separate multiracial categories. Thus overall multiracial trends and subgroup differences can be assessed (Bennett 2011). However, the Census does have its limitations that impact the study of multiracial persons.

The way the Census structures the race question encourages specific kinds of multiracial identification and makes it possible to analyze some responses and impossible to analyze others. Specifically, Latino/a multiracials are nearly impossible to examine using the census question the way it is laid out. The race question is set up in a way that is not always congruent with how specific groups define themselves, and has changed over times creating inconsistent identification schemes (Wiheyesinghe and Jackson III 2001; Ferdman and Gallegos 2001). Namely, the Census continues to treat Latino/as as an ethnic group making it very complicated to accurately address inquiries

related to mixed-race Latino/as. Latino/as have an uneasy relationship with the prevailing racial constructs in the U.S. For many foreign-born Latinos/as, racial identity has a different meaning than in the U.S. and is based on different factors than the racial identification schemes that dominates our country (Wiheyesinghe and Jackson III 2001; Snipp 2003; Hirschman et al 2000). As a result, studies have shown that “non-multiracial” Latino/as are more likely to identify as “two or more races” with White and other usually being the racial identifier (Ferdman and Gallegos 2001; Farley 2002). For that reason, mixed-race Latino/as are not accounted for in this analysis. This is not to discount the vastly growing multiracial Latino/a population, which is partially spurred by continuous immigration among this population (Lee and Bean 2004, 2007). The omission of this larger group of multiracials and its implications will be discussed in the final chapter of this analysis. Yet given these limitations of the categories, the Census race categories are nevertheless valuable for this analysis as other studies regarding the segregation of multiracial persons and households have used these same categories (Bennett 2011; Ellis et al 2007). Additionally, the Census race categories are ideal for the investigation of segregation between groups. These categories are widely used in research and viewed as useful, if not perfect (Iceland 2002).

In Table 4.1, I outline the groups used in this analysis. I use the census category of non-Hispanic White to measure the White population. I used the census category of non-Hispanic Black to measure the African American population. I use the census category of non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander to measure the Asian population. I select all respondents who identified Hispanic-Origin to measure the Latino/a

population. I use the “two race only”, non-Hispanic Black-White multiracial population, to measure the Black-White multiracials population. I use the “two race only”, non-Hispanic Asian-White multiracial population, to measure the Asian-White multiracials population. I use the “two race only”, non-Hispanic Black-Asian multiracial population, to measure the Black-Asian multiracials population. I select all respondents who are eighteen years of age and older to capture the adult population.

*American Community Survey 2007-2011, 5 Year Sample*

The American Community Survey (ACS) is a nationwide survey designed to provide communities with reliable and timely demographic, social, economic, and housing data. The U.S. Census Bureau will release data from the ACS in the form of both single-year and multiyear estimates. These estimates represent concepts that are fundamentally different from those associated with sample data from the decennial census form. The primary purpose of the ACS is to measure the changing social and economic characteristics of the U.S. population. In 2010, the Census Bureau began releasing 5-year files. For the purposes of this study, the 2007-2011 5-year file is used, with a total of five percent of the population.

The ACS is used to analyze individual level sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics for each racial group in the analysis. These variables have all been shown to be relevant for studying the residential segregation and residential attainment of racial groups (Logan and Alba 1993, Iceland et al 2006; Darity 2005). The groups are the adult populations of the racial groups of interest, selected by the Non-Hispanic census categories: White, Black/African American, Asian/Pacific Islander,

Black-White multiracial only, Asian-White Multiracial only, Black-Asian multiracial only. All Hispanic-origin respondents were selected to represent Latino/as. The sociodemographic variables are age (years), educational attainment, marital status (married, single, widowed, divorced), nativity (foreign-born), citizenship (US citizen), English language proficiency (English only, bilingual, no-English), and household income (dollars)<sup>7</sup>.

#### *Macro Level Spatial Units for Summary Measures of Segregation*

Residential segregation occurs within some kind of social and spatial context. Many contexts are potentially relevant for segregation patterns. Nevertheless for the purposes of this study, I have adopted Core Based Statistical Areas (CBSAs), which are also known as metropolitan areas, based on the following considerations. CBSAs represent relatively self-contained housing markets—arenas within which groups compete for housing and segregation dynamics “play out.” There are many contexts potentially relevant for segregation patterns, yet CBSAs apply a consistent definition based on an urban core (minimum 10,000 population) and associated by population. I have chosen to use CBSAs with a minimum of 1,000 adult BW and AW multiracials and 400 adult BA multiracials. This results in 46 CBSAs in the analysis. The thresholds for BA multiracials are slightly different given that they are a substantially smaller population than the other two groups and a smaller share of their single-race counterparts. Thus, in order to garner a number of CBSAs with a significant BA population, without sacrificing the number of cases for the other two groups, the criteria

---

<sup>7</sup>All missing data is eliminated and the median scores are presented in the descriptive chapter due to the wide range of reporting on the income question.

is set up differently for this smaller group. The logic behind restricting the analysis to these select cases rather than all CBSA's are they provide trustworthy data regarding the groups of interest. Some of the restriction is based on identifying cities where there are going to be adequate data available and a population of relevance. These cities are not viewed as a representative sample of all cities in the nation but instead meet certain characteristics that allow for the investigation of the population of interest.

#### *Micro-Level Spatial Units for Measuring Segregation*

Likewise, segregation is assessed using some definition of neighborhood or other relevant "units" of observation for spatial distribution. Several options are used in segregation research (census blocks, block groups, tracts, regions, states etc.) however I have adopted census blocks based on the following considerations:

Small spatial units are needed to reliably detect segregation of small populations. A census block generally has only 30 to 50 persons. For small groups, it is important to use small spatial units in order to accurately measure segregation. Larger units, such as census tracts, which are used in the Bennett study, can obscure segregation that might be observed when looking at a more "fine grained" spatial resolution. However, these smaller populations and spatial units pose problems for conventional segregation indices, which has not been addressed by the previous research on residential segregation of multiracial persons. These problems will be addressed in the sections to follow.

## Summary Measures of Residential Segregation

### *Measures of Uneven Distribution*

In their landmark article, *The Dimensions of Residential Segregation*, Massey and Denton (1988) outline five different dimensions of segregation. Two of these dimensions will be measured in this study, *evenness* and *exposure*. In general, evenness is described as comparing the spatial distribution of two different groups across a spatial unit. A group is said to be experiencing unevenness if they are disproportionately distributed over the areal unit under study; that is, if their relative representation in the areal unit departs from their relative representation in the city overall.

Measures of unevenness provide us with information on a two-group comparison in the city. They indicate a group's departure from evenness in a two-group comparison. I will use the unbiased versions of two well-known measures of evenness. I will discuss their conventional usage first and then discuss why the unbiased versions are superior. Again, measures of unevenness are among the most widely used measures in segregation research. However, as stated previously, small spatial units as well as small populations present problems for these conventional indices. As a feature of this investigation, I will present the unbiased versions of two well known measures of unevenness, the *index of dissimilarity (D)* and the *separation index (V)* which were introduced by Fossett and Zhang (2011).<sup>8</sup> The main benefit of the unbiased measures is that they make it possible to study segregation of smaller populations in a more reliable way. To adequately

---

<sup>8</sup>Fossett shared material from his forthcoming book on these measures.

explain these benefits, I will first discuss their conventional usage to make the case for why the unbiased versions are ideal for my analysis.

*Conventional Indices: Index of Dissimilarity and Separation Index*

Prior to the Massey and Denton article (1988), Duncan and Duncan (1955) laid out a series of measures to capture residential segregation. Among the various measures featured were the index of dissimilarity and the separation index (termed the correlation ratio in their article). I note here that the separation index has been known by many other names including, among others, the variance ratio (James and Taeuber 1985); the correlation ratio and eta squared (Duncan and Duncan 1955); and the revised index of isolation (Bell 1954). All of these alternative names and more also are mentioned in Stearns and Logan (1986:127). Yet, none of the measures that were discussed in that article are still used today except for the index of dissimilarity (D) and the separation index (V). I will begin with a discussion of the index of dissimilarity and transition to the separation index.

The index of dissimilarity is often viewed as the workhorse of empirical studies on residential segregation. It is a widely used measure and to not include it in studies of residential segregation would raise eyebrows. Conceptually dissimilarity yields the minimum percentage of one group that would have to change area of residence in order to bring about exact even distribution with the second group. Note that uneven distribution is defined on the basis of what is known as a “pair-wise” comparison. The term pair-wise indicates that only the counts for the pair of groups in the two-group comparison are used in calculating the contact and exposure outcomes in the areal unit,



in this case neighborhoods. For example, if we are interested in the segregation relationship between whites and BW persons, a pair-wise comparison is calculated at the neighborhood level (i.e., the block level) based on the proportion white in the pair-wise population (whites + BW; all other groups are left out of the calculation) for the area. The index ranges from 0.0 (complete integration) to 1.0 (complete segregation) but can also be multiplied by 100 to get a percentage score.

Like (D), the separation index (V), is a well-known and widely used measure of uneven distribution (Duncan and Duncan 1955; Zoloth 1976; Sterns and Logan 1986). (V) is “fundamentally a variance-based measure, which can be understood as the ratio of the variance in racial composition between neighborhoods to the total variance in racial composition” (Sterns and Logan 1986:127). Relatedly, Zoloth (1976), who terms the measure the “segregation index” describes it as indicated the amount of variation in the binomial variable race that is explained by areal units (i.e., the ratio of between area variation in race to total variation in race). Fossett and Zhang (2011) use the term separation index to refer to the measure based on a new interpretation they introduce that is currently used in the literature now. Specifically, they note that the measure indicates the degree to which two groups are separated from each other based on living in areas where their own group predominates.

For the purposes of this study, I acknowledge the various names for (V) but streamline the discussion and use “separation index” from henceforth. Nevertheless (V) is an attractive measure for this line of investigation because (V) measures group differences in average magnitude of departure from even distribution thus providing a

more substantive interpretation. (V) indicates the disparity in how much contact on average multiracials has with whites in comparison to whites. (V) is advantageous as it signals *residential polarization*, as (D) does not (Sterns and Logan 1986). Residential polarization is substantively important as it more closely represents “prototypical” examples of severe segregation. Polarization indicates that the two groups live apart in neighborhoods that differ fundamentally on ethnic composition. Polarization is important because it registers conditions where segregation carries the potential to be consequential. Groups must live apart in order to experience different residential outcomes. A rule of thumb for polarization is its substantial when a majority of both groups live in areas where their own group is at least 60-65 percent of the combined group population.

There are many alternative ways to calculate (D) and (V). The following equations (Massey and Denton 1988; Zoloth 1976) showcase how (D) and (V) can be seen as having very similar constructions based on measured average departure of area ethnic proportion ( $p_i$ ) and overall city ethnic proportion ( $P$ ):

$$D = \frac{1}{2} PQ \Sigma \left[ \left( \frac{t_i}{T} \right) |p_i - P| \right]$$

$$V = \frac{1}{2PQ} \Sigma \left[ \left( \frac{t_i}{T} \right) (p_i - P)^2 \right]$$

where  $p_i$  is pairwise proportion  $p_i = x_i/t_i$

where  $t_i$  also is pairwise  $t_i = x_i + y_i$

Where  $t_i$  and  $p_i$  are the total population of the two groups under investigation and minority proportion of areal unit  $i$  and  $T$  and  $P$  are the population size (of the two groups) and minority proportion of the whole city, which is subdivided into  $n$  areal units. Both of these equations revolve around the proportion function. Each equation is comparing the persons' neighborhood to the neighborhoods in the city so the right side of the equations is calculating the average person's departure from the city white proportion white (or reference group). Thus, these equations answer the question of, on average, how does ethnic composition in individual neighborhoods differ from the ethnic composition of the city? These two measures, and  $(D)$  in particular, have dominated the research in residential segregation as the premier measure of segregation between groups.

The key difference between  $D$  and  $V$  is that  $(D)$  can register high levels of uneven distribution even when there is not polarization while  $V$  will only register high levels of uneven distribution when it involves polarization. As a result it is useful to examine results for both  $D$  and  $V$  to determine if  $(V)$  is telling the "same" story as  $D$ . When  $(D)$  is substantially higher than  $(V)$  (the reverse cannot be possible—see Fossett 2008 for further discussion),  $(D)$  is telling us that the segregation pattern has uneven distribution but  $V$  is indicating when the uneven distribution does not involve polarization meaning that the neighborhoods of these two groups aren't that fundamentally different on racial/ethnic composition. This difference can be important as generally neighborhoods that whites reside in have advantages over predominately minority neighborhoods in terms of resources and neighborhood quality. Thus, if

multiracials have on average low proportion white in their neighborhoods as compared to whites, this is indicative of potential neighborhood disparities on a wide range of neighborhood outcomes as well as existing negative race relations.

*D and V as Differences of Means: Alternative Formulas for Conventional Index Values*

Fossett and Zhang (2011) have shown that D and V can be expressed as *difference of means*. These alternative formulations are useful for two reasons. First, the formulas highlight why D and V respond differently to uneven distribution that does not involve polarization. Second, the formulas are advantageous for implementing refinements that eliminate the well-known problem of index bias that can make indices of uneven distribution problematic in certain situations.

Difference of means formulations for D and V are straightforward. Taking V first, you begin by calculating a score for every individual in the city to describe the neighborhood they live in. For V, that score is proportion white ( $p_i$ ) for the area in which the individual resides. Then you calculate the separate averages for all whites all blacks (or multiracials, etc.). The difference of the two averages yields the segregation score.<sup>9</sup>

The exact same approach applies for D. But instead of the individual's score being proportion white in their neighborhood ( $p_i$ ), the score is 0 or 1 depending on whether or not the proportion white in the neighborhood is above or below the proportion white for the city (score 1 if yes). Take the average score for whites, the

---

<sup>9</sup>See Fossett forthcoming for detailed discussion and review of difference of means formulations for all popular indices of uneven distribution including derivations establishing the mathematical equivalence of difference of means formulations with prevailing computing formulas.

average score for blacks, and the difference is D. The formulas are as follows (Fossett and Zhang 2011):

$$D' = (Y_1 - Y_2) = \frac{(\sum n_{1i} y_i)}{N_1} - \frac{(\sum n_{2i} y_i)}{N_2}$$

$$V' = (Y_1 - Y_2) = \frac{(\sum n_{1i} y_i)}{N_1} - \frac{(\sum n_{2i} y_i)}{N_2}$$

where  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are group means on residential outcomes for households ( $y_i$ ) scored from area ethnic composition ( $p_i$ ) as follows

for D,  $y_i = 1$  if  $p_i > P$ , and 0 otherwise

for V,  $y_i = p_i$

where  $p_i$  and  $P$  are group proportions for the area and city as a whole, respectively, based on

$$p_i = \frac{n_{1i}}{(n_{1i} + n_{2i})}$$

and

$$P = \frac{N_{1i}}{(N_{1i} + N_{2i})}$$

If we continue with the example of Black-White segregation, D in this formulation is the Black-White difference in the proportion experiencing above average contact with Whites. In comparison, V in this formulation is the Black-White difference in average contact with Whites. Both indices thus can be understood as summary measures of group differences in contact and exposure.

The key difference between the two indices then is the manner in which they register contact. Both are the same in the fact that they register contact as a simple

function of pair-wise area proportion white ( $p_i$ ). V registers the level of contact observed and thus is sensitive to the magnitude of the differences involved. In contrast, D collapses values of  $p_i$  into just two scores, 0 or 1. D treats all positive departures from even distribution the same, assigning them a score of 1 if proportion white in the neighborhood the individual resides ( $p_i$ ) is above the proportion for the city's pair-wise comparison as a whole ( $P$ ) and it treats all other outcomes the same by assigning them a score of 0.

This difference between D and V clarifies why D can reach high levels when uneven distribution does not involve polarization while in contrast, V can only reach high values when polarization is present. D will register high levels for white-black segregation in any condition where whites consistently live in neighborhoods where whites are over-represented while blacks consistently live in neighborhoods where whites are under-represented. That condition is necessary for V to reach high values, but it is not sufficient. For V to take a high value it is additionally necessary that blacks' contact with whites be markedly lower than whites' contact with whites. Accordingly, if average deviations from  $P$  are small for both whites and blacks, V will take a low score even though whites are consistently more likely than blacks to live in areas where whites are over-represented. Stated another way, D responds equally strongly to small and large departures from uneven distribution and V only responds strongly to larger departures from uneven distribution.

### Index Bias

It is well documented that all popular indices of uneven distribution have inherited upward bias (Winship 1977; Massey and Fisher 1999). In general, bias can be negligible, but not always. Bias becomes an issue with the populations are small. Smaller populations can make index scores untrustworthy and misleading primarily due to the inflation of scores. The multiracial population as a whole is less than 10% of the U.S. population and when they are broken up into subgroups based racial composition, these groups can get even smaller thus the problem of bias is of particular concern when utilizing conventional indices of uneven distribution. Previous research on multiracial residential segregation does not address this issue of bias in their use of the conventional measures (Bennett 2011). The scores reported in that study are subject to upward bias and may in fact be misleading in their conclusions. Furthermore, D is more susceptible to bias than V, however bias is potentially important for both (Winship 1977). Thus the elimination of bias in both indices will be discussed in the following section.

### Eliminating Bias

Fossett and Zhang (2011) have shown that the difference of means formulations of D and V help identify the source of bias in measures of uneven distribution and also an opportunity to refine index calculations to eliminate bias. The essence of the situation is this. The difference of means formulations of D and V show that scores for indices of uneven distribution trace to contact scores for individuals (i.e.,  $p_i$ ). Bias originates in these contact scores in a simple way that is easy to understand and also easy to correct. In conventional calculations, the individual is included in the terms used to compute the

contact score. As a result,  $p_i$  for whites is automatically higher than  $p_i$  for blacks (by the amount  $1/[n_{1i}+n_{2i}]$ ). If the individual is removed from the terms used to compute the contact scores, this source of bias is eliminated. For example, when calculating the contact score for a white person, remove that person from the terms in the equation and do the same thing with blacks. Thus, the contact calculation changes from:

$$p_i = n_{1i} / (n_{1i} + n_{2i})$$

for both whites and blacks to

$$p_i = (n_{1i} - 1) / (n_{1i} - 1 + n_{2i})$$

for whites and

$$p_i = n_{1i} / (n_{1i} + n_{2i} - 1)$$

for blacks.

The modification can be explained in the following simple terms. The standard calculation registers contact based on the *population* in the area where the individual resides and the individual contributes to the area population introducing the source of bias. The modified calculation registers contact based on the *neighbors* in the areas where the individual resides and the individual is not included so the source of bias is eliminated.

Logically this makes sense, as the individual is the reference point and should not be included in the calculation of who lives in the individual's own neighborhood. Removing the referenced individual rids the score of the problematic upward bias that becomes worse when the counts are small (as is clear from the bias term  $1/[n_{1i}+n_{2i}]$  noted above).



These unbiased indices were developed by Fossett and Zhang (2011) and are more appropriate for measuring segregation when the groups in question are very small or are subdivided into small groups for the sake of detailed comparisons. In the literature the only solution that researchers have found is to simply avoid these situations. However, Fossett and Zhang (2011) have formulated a way to remove this upward bias, making it possible to look at segregation of small groups in small areas. As stated previously, I am addressing multiracial segregation at the block level thus the unbiased measures are ideal for this type of investigation.

The unbiased versions of D and V are computed using the difference of means formulations of D and V. The only difference is that the terms for contact with whites ( $p_i$ ) are obtained using the modified calculation described above. The unbiased versions of D and V are denoted by adding a “prime” to designate the distinction and thus are given as D' and V'.

#### *Polarization Index*

Also featured in this study is the *polarization index*. This index involves calculating the percentage of each group in the pairwise comparison living in neighborhoods that are least 65 percent of their same group. The polarization score is obtained by simply taking the lower of these two scores to provide the overall polarization index. High scores result when individuals in both groups consistently live in neighborhoods where their group predominates. These measures are very closely correlated with V'. V' indicates groups live in fundamentally different kinds of neighborhoods meaning the ethnic composition on average for one group is completely

different than the ethnic composition for another group. The polarization index crystalizes this point by indicating just how much these two groups live in neighborhoods where they are ethnically isolated. Essentially, the polarization index is answering the question, to what extent do both groups live in same group neighborhoods?

In this comparison, the polarization scores are essentially examining the prevalence of living in predominately white areas for whites and the prevalence of living in predominately Black areas for Blacks. If there is a lot of segregation, both scores will be high—most whites would live in majority white areas and most Blacks would live in majority Black areas. For example, in Detroit, a city well-known for having a high level of white-black segregation and which stands as a prototype of extreme segregation, 90 percent of whites live in areas that are 65 percent white or more, while 85 percent of Blacks live in areas that are 65 percent Black. Because both numbers are high, it means those two groups are polarized because they live primarily in areas where their group predominates. In contrast, in Edison 77 percent of whites live in areas that are 65 percent white, but only 23 percent of Blacks live in neighborhoods that are 65 percent black. This means that means 77 percent of blacks are living in neighborhoods that are less than 65 percent Black. This signals that Edison is not characterized by the extreme polarization as seen in Detroit.

### *Overview*

D is the most widely used measure of uneven distribution. It is often serviceable but we must also recognize the limitations of D and in this we must consider

circumstance that would be wise to consider alternative methods and measures. While D is more widely used than V, V is equal or superior on technical grounds and is a legitimate option for measuring uneven distribution. For example, D is highly volatile when spatial units are small and groups are unequal in size while V is less affected by area size than D and is V is not affected by groups being unequal in size (Winship 1978). In addition, the unbiased version of V ( $V'$ ) also signals residential polarization and thus a more attractive measure of uneven distribution for this study. While I have chosen V over D however it is useful to report both scores to offer a comparative component to continue to make the case for V in the investigation of the segregation of smaller populations. As stated before, D and V can agree and when they do, the story is simple: when both D and V are high, it is a pattern that can be described as “prototypical” segregation; the groups live apart in neighborhoods that differ fundamentally on ethnic composition. When both D and V are low, groups have similar residential outcomes. However, when D and V disagree, the story is more complicated. D will be high and V will be very low, this reflects uneven distribution without polarization. This is not prototypical segregation.

While  $V'$  is a superior measure, there are overall limitations to measures of uneven distribution. These measures are telling us something about the cities under question but in a much more limited way given that it is a pair-wise comparison. The other groups that are in the city are left out of the comparison that can eliminate dynamics that are factors in multiracial cities like Los Angeles or New York. This

limitation addresses the rationale for the other measures featured in this study, exposure/contact and neighborhood racial composition.

## **Summary Measures of Residential Contact/Exposure**

### *Measures of Exposure*

Measures of residential exposure and isolation take into consideration all groups within the spatial unit. These measures take into account the overall diversity in the neighborhood so you can look at contact with all groups at once. Thus exposure is all about overall ethnic composition and asks the question, on average, who do groups live with? Indices range between 0.0 and 1.0 and they may be interpreted as the probability that a randomly drawn X-member shares an area with a member of Y or the probability that he or she shares a unit with another x member. The converse of the interaction index is the isolation index, which measures the extent to which minority members are exposed only to one other, rather than to major members, and it is computed as the minority-weighted average of each unit's minority proportion. An isolation score of 80.2 for Whites means that the average White lives in a neighborhood that is 80.2% White. An exposure score of 6.7 for White-black exposure indicates that the average White lives in a neighborhood that is 6.7% black. Exposure thus depends on the extent to which two groups share common residential areas, and hence, on the degree to which the average minority group member "experiences" segregation.

Indices of evenness and exposure are correlated but measure different things: minority members can be evenly distributed among residential areas of a city, but at the same time experience little exposure to majority members if they are relatively larger

proportion of the city (Blau 1977; Iceland et al 2002). Conversely, if they are a very small proportion, minority members will tend to experience high levels of exposure to the majority no matter what the patterns of evenness. Exposure indices take explicit account of the relative size of minority and majority groups in determining the degree of residential segregation between them.

The formula for measures of exposure and contact are as follows (Massey and Denton 1988):

$$xP^*y = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{x_i}{X} \right] \left[ \frac{y_i}{t_i} \right]$$

Where  $x_i$ ,  $y_i$ , and  $t_i$  are the numbers of X members, Y members, and the total population of unit  $i$ , respectively, and  $X$  represents the number of X members citywide.

Where  $t_i$  = total population in the area

$x_i/X$  = calculating the group share, that is  $x_i$  is the portion of the group in tract  $i$  and the  $X$  is the city level total,  $X$  is a place holder.

$y_i/t_i$  = ethnic composition variable—proportion of other group in the neighborhood.

This measure of exposure is an important deviation from measures of uneven distribution. If all that is examined is how two groups are evenly distributed amongst each other, there might other dynamics happening that are missed. For example, multiracial persons may experience high levels of segregation from Whites but actually live close to Latinos/as and Asians, which would not come through at all with measures of uneven distribution given they are pair-wise comparisons between Whites and

multiracial persons. Instead measures of exposure and contact ask what groups of interest (say blacks, Whites and multiracials) on neighborhood outcomes of ethnic composition that is either isolation or exposure to other groups?

The limitations of these contact scores are in many ways their strength. They are simple means, which offer simple and tangible interpretation but are like any other mean and are subjected to skewedness. Means are great when distributions are uni-modal but when they are complicated, means can be at worst, misleading. For example, a worst case scenario would be if half of multiracial persons lived in one extreme type of neighborhood and the other live in the other extreme, the average is going to say they live in a 50% neighborhood or in the middle, when no one really lives there. These are important to consider when interpreting these scores.

## **Measure of Neighborhood Diversity**

### *Neighborhood Diversity Index*

The term diversity is employed to describe the position of a population along a continuum ranging from homogeneity to heterogeneity with respect to one or more qualitative variables (Lieberson 1969). The diversity index measures the diversity level in the geographic area being studied. It synthesizes information about the number of groups and the proportion of each group in the area. Understanding diversity in an area can be viewed as the first step to understanding multi-group segregation (Hao and Fong 2010). There are various measures of neighborhood diversity. For the purposes of this study we will examine the *Gini/Simpson Index*. The Gini/Simpson index usually describes the probability that two members of the population chosen at random will be

of different subpopulations. Its minimum is zero for the presence of a single group and reaches a maximum of  $1-(1/s)^2$  under evenness.

$$S = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^K (P_k)^2$$

In the Gini/Simpson index, if Whites live in all White neighborhoods, their diversity exposure is zero. But if they live in neighborhoods that have a variety of groups present, they will get some positive value up to 100.

#### *Measure of Distribution by Neighborhood Proportion White*

To aid in answering the question, for the average multiracial person, what kind of neighborhood do they live in? I am incorporating a measure of neighborhood distribution by proportion White. It will be measured using five cut-off points (0-19, 20-39, 40-59, 60-79, 80-100) to represent the percent White in each neighborhood type. This is a simple and straightforward measure with a particular focus on the White population. The same detailed analysis can be replicated for any other group and the logical next choice would be the minority group in the comparison. I have selected to focus on the White population as it is the majority group, presumably the hardest to gain access to and predominately White neighborhoods are, in general, more advantageous in terms of resources, housing values and neighborhood quality (Charles 2003, 2006).

## CHAPTER V

### LIVING ON DIFFERENT LEVELS: SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

In this chapter, we take a more strategic examination of the demographic characteristics that directly impact the residential attainment of racial and ethnic groups. *Spatial Assimilation* and the *Eclectic Group Differences* perspective rely on the sociodemographic differences between groups to state their claims. Each claims know that certain ethnic and racial differences have, for many reasons, been deemed socially significant, some of which can be examined empirically. To this end, only those variables thought to be especially relevant to these perspectives. Each framework expresses the importance of demographic characteristics and/or status attainment measures as the means for group differences in residential outcomes. The following is an overview of select social and economic characteristics of the multiracial and single-race populations in this study. This aggregate level analysis will allow for inferences made at the individual level and across CBSAs.

Recall that the *Spatial Assimilation* theory emphasized group differences across socioeconomic status, arguing objective difference in socioeconomic status and acculturation account for residential segregation. Namely, a higher socioeconomic status, increased educational attainment, and occupational prestige will increase residential integration with the majority group. For immigrants, the process also involves acculturation—the acclimation of time in the United States and acquisition of English-language fluency (Charles 2006). Here integration reflects a group's



acculturation and socioeconomic position but also facilitates its overall social mobility. Conversely, Jiobu claims certain features of a group's demography predispose the group toward socioeconomic achievements greatly impacting their residential opportunities (Jiobu 1990).

The Eclectic Group *Differences perspective*, group size or perceived group size, among other demographic variable is one of the most notable factors contributing to differential outcomes for racial and ethnic minority groups. When competition is higher or low, it impacts group opportunity and is often dictated by group size (Creedy and Fossett 1998). Thus, the groups differences perspective anticipates that a small group, such as multiracials, will experience lower levels of segregation from the dominant group.

### **Population Parameters**

To start, Table 5.1 presents a demographic summary of the groups in this analysis, disaggregated by single-race and multiracial groups using data from the 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS), five-percent sample. In this chapter we will examine their general population demographics, social class characteristics, and acculturation indicators of multiracials in comparison to other single-race groups. The data show that whites are the oldest single-race group (49), nearly 10 years older than Latino/as (40) and six years older than Blacks and Asians in the sample. Moreover, for each of the single-race groups, the majority share of the population is an adult. Asians and whites are nearly identical in the percent of the population that are adult and

**Table 5.1 Sociodemographic Characteristics by Racial Group**

<b>Sociodemographic Characteristics</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Latino/a</b>	<b>Black-White</b>	<b>Asian-White</b>	<b>Black-Asian</b>
<b>Population</b>							
Total Sample Size	196,825,386	37,434,373	14,778,912	49,183,364	1,547,360	1,432,100	165,110
Percent Children	20	28	23	34	69	52	36
Percent Adult	80	72	78	66	31	48	51
<b>Adult Population</b>							
<b>Age</b>	49	43	43	40	32	36	42
<b>Marital Status %</b>							
Married	56	32	61	49	27	43	31
Single	22	44	28	35	60	46	45
Other	20	24	11	16	13	11	24
<b>Education %</b>							
No School	0.54	1.20	2.94	3.12	0.68	0.98	1.53
1-8	2.25	3.49	4.35	16.80	1.67	1.22	2.43
9-12 (No Degree)	7.09	14.27	6.25	16.49	10.89	5.46	7.78
High School/GED	29.50	32.20	17.19	27.87	27.84	20.98	23.15
Some	31.68	32.95	23.78	24.33	39.62	37.56	41.88
College/Associates							
Bachelors Degree	18.55	10.28	27.78	8.00	13.55	22.91	15.41
Grad/Professional	10.40	5.28	17.70	3.39	5.75	18.88	7.92
<b>Household Income</b>							
Mean	78,272.91	51,492.03	90,653.49	54,807.30	58,462.24	84,915.00	59,064.68
Median	58,742.00	38,180.00	70,000.00	41,388.00	42,486.00	64,524.00	42,689.00
<b>Measures of Acculturation %</b>							
Foreign Born	5	11	80	58	9	29	15
U.S. Citizen	98	95	67	64	97	93	96
Only English	94	92	21	20	92	78	89
Bilingual	6	7	74	69	9	21	11
No English	0	0	4	10	0	0	0

children. The adult population ranges from 66 to 80 percent of the single-race population. The Latino/a population is the most youthful out of the single-race groups, which is much attributed to the immigration patterns within this group (Saenz et al 2004; Lee and Bean 2004; Phillips and Massey and Denton 1987). Overall, whites and Asians are the oldest of the single-race groups followed by Blacks and Latino/as.

In stark contrast to the single-race groups, the majority share of the population for the Black-white and Asian-white multiracial groups are children. For the Black-white population, 69 percent are children, and 52 percent of Asian-white population is children. Black-Asian multiracials are the only group that is majority adults. Given the youthfulness of the overall multiracial population, and the fact that Black-Asian multiracial persons experienced 74 percent growth from 2000-2010 censuses, it is in many ways surprising that they are the “oldest” multiracial group in the analysis. They are the only group that are over the age of 40 and have an adult share of the population that is larger than the children’s share. Although there is not much known about Black-Asian multiracials, it is reasonable to speculate that a portion of this population are a result of interracial unions occurring during the Vietnam War (Le 2010). The children of these unions would be in their early 40s, which is reflected in these data. This assumption is unable to be confirmed. This is a line of inquiry for future research. Nonetheless, all three of these multiracial groups are significantly smaller in size to the single-race groups. The overall multiracial population is less than ten percent of the total U.S. population and is obviously small when groups are disaggregated. The Black-Asian population is the smallest multiracial group in the analysis. It is less than half the size of

the Black-White population and less than half the size of the Asian-white population. The Black-white and Asian-white groups are still extraordinarily smaller than the single-race population. For example, the Asian population is ten times larger than the Asian-white population. These differences in age structure and overall size should result in favorable outcomes for multiracial residential attainment if in fact, Jiobu's approach is correct.

### **Marital Status**

While marital status is not directly addressed in the theoretical perspectives outlined in this study, marital status has implications for socioeconomic status and mobility (household income). It is also an indicator of a stabilizing event in adulthood (Waite 2005; Riley 2005). Asians have the highest percent married of all groups in the study, both single and multi-race. Of the single-race groups, Blacks have the highest percent single (44), while Asians have the lowest (28). African American marriage patterns, marriage pools, and partnering patterns are well documented and discussed and uneven marriage market that could have implications for overall marriage rates (Sweeny and Philips 2004; Clarkwest 2006). The Latino/a population has the second highest percentage of single persons. Whites have the second highest percentage of married persons and the lowest percentage of single persons of the single-race groups.

The marriage patterns of single-race groups are well established (Bean et al 1996; Clarkwest 2006; Ferguson 1995; Sweeny and Philips 2004), yet this is less of the case for multiracial Americans. There is relatively little known regarding the marriage patterns of multiracial persons. We do not have a good handle on understanding who

they marry, when they marry, the duration of marriages, cohabiting patterns, and so on. These patterns have implications for family structures, the racial identity patterns of the multiracial adult and their children, family income and so much more. Their patterns also complicate what we know about interracial marriage patterns. We know little about the romantic patterns of the children of interracial unions and mixed-race heritage (Houston et al. 2005). This table offers some insight to the trends in multiracial marital status. The marital patterns of Black-Asian multiracials are nearly identical to the marital patterns of African Americans. Conversely, their patterns stand in stark contrast to patterns of the Asian population.

Like Asians, Asian-white multiracials have the lowest percentage of those who are separated, divorced, or widowed. Black-Asians, on the other hand, have nearly double the percentage of separation, divorce, or widowhood compared to Black-white multiracials. Black-white multiracials are mostly single with only 27 percent of the population married. They have the largest percentage of single persons than any other multiracial group. Compared to their single-race counterparts, Black-white multiracials are more similar to Black Americans. However, Black-white multiracials are the youngest multiracial group and are more than ten years younger than Black Americans and white Americans. Thus their marriage patterns may in part, reflect the youth of their population. Asian-White multiracials have the highest percentage of the population married in comparison to all of the multiracial groups. This is similar to their single-race counterparts. Asian Americans have the highest percentage of the population married for the single-race groups and whites come in second.

## **Socioeconomic Attainment**

The table also presents selected measures of socioeconomic attainment and acculturation. According to Spatial Assimilation Theory, differences in socioeconomic status and acculturation explain differences in residential differences (Alba et al. 1999; Logan and Alba 1993, 1995). Thus, if these groups differ on these characteristics in a meaningful way, we can expect differing residential outcomes for these groups.

Educational attainment is an indicator of social class status and is implicated as a key component in social status and mobility. The multiracial groups here all have a higher percentage of those with some college than the single-race groups. They each have a higher percentage of those with a bachelor's degree and a graduate or professional degree than Blacks or Latino/as. Black Americans and Latino/as continue to experience lower levels of educational attainment than other racial groups compared to both single and multiracial groups.

Within the multiracial population, Asian-white persons stand out as having the highest percentage of college, graduate or professional degrees, much like the patterns of Asian American educational attainment. Asians have the highest percent of their population completing bachelor's, graduate and/or professional degrees, followed by whites. Black-white educational attainment patterns fall between the attainment patterns of single-race whites and Blacks. However their patterns are only marginally higher than the attainment of Blacks. This is the same for Black-Asians. The Black-Asian education attainment falls between their single-race counterparts, however their patterns are closer to that of Blacks than Asians. Overall, multiracials have higher percentages of persons

with some college, than single-race groups, which can be associated to the youthfulness of their population. Overall, the educational attainment of multiracials often falls between their parent groups although they are above the attainment of Blacks and Latino/as.

Household income directly impacts residential opportunities. In reporting the median household income, we can see that Asian Americans have the highest median household income. Asian-white multiracials have a higher median household income than all other groups in the analysis, except for Asians. All multiracial groups have higher household income than Blacks and Latino/as. Despite having higher levels of educational attainment, Blacks have a lower household level income than Latino/as, reflecting the findings that after a certain level, education attainment works against Blacks Americans regarding status attainment (Charles 2003, 2006). Within the multiracial population, Asian-whites stand out in stark contrast to the other groups, experiencing an over \$ 20,000 difference in household income. Black-White and Black-Asian household income is nearly identical with Black-Asians reporting a slightly higher amount. While both of these multiracial groups have higher levels of household income than their Black counterparts, whites bring home over \$16,000 more than both groups. Asians bring home around \$28,000 more than Black-Asians.

### **Measures of Acculturation**

Measures of acculturation are established in the existing literature on the residential attainment of immigrant groups to the U.S. (Massey and Denton 1985; Charles 2003). Research concludes it is likely that over time, residential separation

might diminish between whites and immigrant groups, as the foreign-born spend more time in the United States and acculturate via English language acquisition and naturalization and social mobility is achieved by later U.S.-born generations. However, consistent immigration patterns of certain groups may impede the acculturation process (Neckerman et al. 1999). Moreover, various models of assimilation and theories of social distance state that intermarriage with the dominant groups is expected to further decrease social distance from the dominant group. Thus we can expect the offspring of those unions, multiracial groups, to experience higher rates of acculturation than their single-race counterparts. I recognize that the measures and assumptions of acculturation, assimilation and social distance are heavily critiqued due to the centralization of the white, European immigrant experience. However, the perspectives outlined in this project centralize these assumptions and thus they will be examined.

Over 90 percent of multiracials in this study are U.S. citizens and over 75 percent speak only English. However, there are distinct differences among the multiracial groups. Black-white multiracials are similar with over 90 percent U.S. citizens and speaking only English. Blacks and whites have the lowest percentage of foreign-born and bilingual persons in the population than any other group. Only 9 percent of the Black-White population is foreign-born and 9 percent are bilingual. This is in contrast to the Black-Asian and Asian-white multiracial groups.

Fifteen percent of Black-Asians are foreign-born and 11 percent are bilingual. However 96 percent are U.S. citizens. Twenty-nine percent of Asian-whites are foreign-born. This is nearly twice as high as Black-Asians and three times as high for Black-



whites. And while 93 percent of Asian-whites are U.S. citizens, 21 percent are bilingual. Asian-white multiracials have the largest bilingual population of the multiracial groups.

The patterns for Asian-whites can in part be explained by the impact of the large Asian immigrant population (Lee and Bean 2004). This is the same for the single-race Asian group. Asians have the highest rate of foreign born (80 percent), bilingual (74 percent) and one lowest percentages of U.S. citizenship (67 percent). However, social scientists have documented that acculturation is no longer the surest path to successful economic incorporation, as the “straight-line” model suggests. By illustration with the Asian population, it is well documented that immigrants and their children who adopt a path of selective assimilation use the resources within the immigrant ethnic community and maintain a strong sense of ethnic identity as buffering mechanisms to shield them from the spiral of downward mobility in the face of economic disadvantage (Portes and Zhou 1993). In fact, for many immigrant groups, casting off one’s immigrant identity can lead to downward mobility—a concept that directly challenges the dominant sociological paradigm of straight-line assimilation (Waters 1999, Zhou & Bankston 1998). This results in the cultural accommodation that facilitated structural incorporation for white immigrants, is not as crucial or even necessary for recent immigrants. Using the results in Table 5.1, the Asian household income and educational attainment in comparison to their measures of acculturation, illustrates the decoupling of the traditional linkages thought to exist between acculturation and economic mobility (Neckerman et al. 1999, Portes & Zhou 1993).

Although the Latino/a multiracial population is not directly investigated in this analysis it is important to note that Latino/as are the second largest foreign-born population amongst the groups in this study. There is much research on their segmented assimilation patterns, acculturation and economic mobility. However, what is of particular interest regarding this study is how their foreign born status may lead to high rates of out-marriage. This has implications for high rates of intermarriage and multiracial births (Lee and Bean 2004, 2007; Gallagher 2007).

## **Conclusion**

The multiracial subgroups in this analysis vary on sociodemographic characteristics but in general share similar levels of educational attainment and measure of acculturation with the majority group. However, when there are differences among subgroups, these differences suggest a pattern in which the multiracial groups follow their minority single-race counterparts. In the case of dual minority status multiracials, they follow the trends of their lower status group. Asian-white multiracials have the highest household income and educational attainment out of all the multiracial subgroups. Thus their residential patterns are expected to result in a higher proximity to whites than the other multiracial groups. While the multiracial population is significantly smaller and younger than the single-race groups, Black-Asians are nearly the same age as Black Americans. However, Black-Asians are distinctively smaller than the other two multiracial groups. According to the eclectic group differences perspective we can expect Black-Asians to have the least restriction on them in the housing market and potentially live the closest in proximity to whites. However it is evident that the

multiracial groups often hold an intermediary space between these single-race groups. Thus while the multiracial groups as a whole have higher educational attainment and income than some of the single-race groups, they are still the same as whites, with the exception at times of Asian-white multiracials.

With this in mind, we can anticipate how these characteristics of the multiracial population impact the theoretical claims that rely heavily on status attainment and sociodemographic characteristics to explain residential patterns. Given the trends in income, educational attainment, acculturation and size, both the spatial assimilation theory and the eclectic group differences theory argue that the multiracial groups in this study should live closer to the dominate group (whites) than their minority counterparts.

## CHAPTER VI

### MAKING CONTACT

Who do multiracial persons alongside? Are they more prone to living with Whites or non-Whites? Do their patterns vary across city contexts? In what ways does neighborhood diversity impact the ways in which multiracials experience residential isolation or integration? To answer these questions, this chapter will utilize a series of contact measures to understand the residential patterns of adult multiracials in relation to the overall ethnic composition of adults in the 49 city sample. Recall in the methods chapter the discussion of measures of residential exposure and isolation. These measures take into consideration the overall ethnic composition of the spatial unit under investigation in order to assess intergroup contact patterns for residential outcomes. In addition, exposure indices take explicit account of the relative size of minority and majority groups in determining the degree of residential segregation between them. These measures will tell us how multiracials co-reside with other groups. Here single-race patterns are presented first to gain a better understanding of well-established patterns in the literature while presenting a comparative element to the contact patterns for multiracial groups. These scores are all about overall ethnic composition and ask the question, on average, who do groups live alongside? Contact scores are averages that tell us, on average, who do groups have contact with when everyone is factored into the neighborhood?

In this chapter, contact is assessed in three different forms in an attempt to get a full and multidimensional picture of multiracial contact with other groups. These forms

of contact are *overall group contact*, *diversity index*, and a *five category measure of distribution by neighborhood proportion White*. Combined, these varied approaches aid in assessing contact in a multi-group context. Contact scores are averages and average scores are helpful in understanding overall patterns. Yet the limitations of averages are that they hide variation among cities. Thus I will present data for a select subset of cities to discuss the variation that occurs across different types of cities.

Moreover, comparing all groups' contact at once is advantageous because when there are multiple groups with different dynamics (for example Latino/a and Asian presence in large numbers in a city, or predominately White cities), how groups co-reside is going to be impacted by these varied demographic contexts (Iceland 2004; Hao and Fong 2010). It is in the best interest to begin the investigation of the residential patterns of multiracials with overall contact patterns. This broad approach will help to gain insight into the larger residential picture in which multiracials are operating.

### **Overall Group Contact**

These contact scores are used to tell us the difference in contact with a selected reference group when all groups are present in the city. These scores assess co-residence with groups that are numerically significant in the U.S. racial hierarchy and serve as parent groups to the multiracial groups of interest in this study. Thus group contact with each of the larger single-race groups is examined here to set the stage for understanding patterns that may have implications for multiracial residential patterns.

### *Contact with Whites*

Table 6.1 captures the contact each group has with the White population. Out of all of the groups, Whites have the most contact with themselves. In the average city, 73 percent of Whites have contact with themselves. In the top 10 percent, Whites' contact with Whites 86 percent in the average city. Asian-White (AW) multiracials have the most contact with Whites than any other single-race and multiracial group. In the average city, 60 percent of AW has contact with Whites. Asians and Black-White multiracials (BW) have nearly identical contact with Whites. These groups find themselves in the middle of the racial hierarchy sharing similar levels of residential exposure to the dominant group.

**Table 6.1 Overall Group Contact with Whites**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black-White</b>	<b>Asian-White</b>	<b>Black-Asian</b>
<b>Observations</b>	49	49	49	49	49	49
<b>Mean</b>	72.51	32.85	50.84	49.77	60.49	42.42
<b>StdDev</b>	11.78	12.37	13.70	10.26	12.62	11.51
<b>Range</b>	28.78	34.09	36.33	25.34	31.94	28.22
<b>10 (percentile)</b>	57.36	15.41	32.64	38.07	44.51	29.10
<b>50 (percentile)</b>	75.58	32.24	54.32	49.81	63.10	42.30
<b>90 (percentile)</b>	86.14	49.50	68.97	63.41	76.45	57.32

Conversely, Blacks have the least amount of contact with Whites. In the average city Black Americans have 33 percent contact with Whites, the lowest out of any of the groups in the analysis. This finding is well documented in the literature, reinforcing the

continued divide between Blacks and Whites in this country (Massey and Denton 1993). Similarly, Black-Asian multiracials (BA) have the least amount of contact with Whites than any other multiracial group. However they experience more contact with Whites than Black Americans experience with Whites. On average, BA experience 42 percent contact with Whites. This is more contact than Blacks have with Whites but less than Asians. Similarly, BW have more contact with Whites than Blacks in the average city. In this case, the Black multiracial groups in this study seem to hold an intermediary space between their parent groups when it relates to their contact with the dominant group. However, AW have more contact with Whites in the average city, than any other group.

*Contact with Black Americans*

**Table 6.2 Overall Group Contact with Blacks**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black-White</b>	<b>Asian-White</b>	<b>Black-Asian</b>
<b>Observations</b>	49	49	49	49	49	49
<b>Mean</b>	6.54	39.41	10.34	19.83	9.09	24.21
<b>StdDev</b>	3.44	20.52	5.36	10.90	4.75	14.16
<b>Range</b>	8.71	52.90	15.14	27.17	13.60	34.79
<b>10 (percentile)</b>	3.14	14.05	3.66	6.82	3.02	7.73
<b>50 (percentile)</b>	5.42	42.05	9.02	18.03	8.36	23.61
<b>90 (percentile)</b>	11.85	66.95	18.80	33.99	16.62	42.52

As seen in Table 6.2 contact with Blacks is far lower in each group than contact with Whites. Whites and AW have less than 10 percent contact with Blacks in the average city. Asian contact with Blacks is also very low at 10 percent, in the average city. On the other hand, BA have the most contact with Blacks. In the average city, BA

have 24 percent contact with Black Americans. BW have the second highest level of contact with Black Americans. In the average city BW contact with Blacks is 19 percent. However, no group, not even Black Americans have contact with Blacks that reaches over 40 percent in the average city. Black Americans have the most contact with themselves out of any other group but it is far less than Whites contact with themselves. This means that Black Americans experience more contact with other groups than Whites experience. Even in the top 10 percent of the cases, Blacks experiences 67 percent contact with themselves as oppose to 83 percent contact Whites have with themselves. Thus in the average city, Blacks live in more diverse neighborhoods than Whites. If Black multiracials follow in the patterns of Blacks, we may expect to find them in more diverse settings than Whites.

#### *Contact with Asians*

In Table 6.3 we see contact with Asians is different from contact with Blacks or Whites. Asians are one of the fastest growing groups in the U.S. and at the same time experience the lowest amounts of contact with other groups than any other reference group. In other words, no group has high contact with Asians. Blacks, Whites and BW have single digit contact with Asians in the average city. Conversely, AW and BA have the highest amount of contact with Asians. AW and BA share nearly the same amount of contact with Asians. This is in contrast to AW and BW contact patterns with their parent groups. Whereas AW have more contact with Whites and BW experienced more contact with Blacks. Moreover, Asians have the most contact with themselves but it is only 22 percent in the average city. This is far lower than White contact with Whites and Black



contact with Blacks. Thus in the average city, Asians are less likely to live in predominately Asian neighborhoods.

**Table 6.3 Overall Group Contact with Asians**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black-White</b>	<b>Asian-White</b>	<b>Black-Asian</b>
<b>Observations</b>	49	49	49	49	49	49
<b>Mean</b>	6.68	7.12	21.49	7.76	10.81	10.49
<b>StdDev</b>	6.08	6.93	11.19	6.58	8.22	8.96
<b>Range</b>	12.44	14.37	28.11	15.12	17.52	18.28
<b>10 (percentile)</b>	2.30	1.90	9.30	2.82	4.31	3.44
<b>50 (percentile)</b>	4.57	4.33	18.78	5.35	7.77	7.39
<b>90 (percentile)</b>	14.74	16.27	37.41	17.94	21.83	21.72

#### *Contact with Latino/as*

While Latino/a multiracials are not in this analysis, the Latino/a population is one of the fastest growing populations in the U.S. as well (Philips and Massey 2000). Their presence is reported to have implications on neighborhood dynamics and multi-group segregation (Hao and Fong 2010). In Table 6.4, all groups in the analysis have around the same amount of contact with Latino/as. Whites have the lowest contact with Latino/as compared to other groups. However it is only two percent lower than Asian and AW contact with Latino/as.

**Table 6.4 Overall Group Contact with Latino/as**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black-White</b>	<b>Asian-White</b>	<b>Black-Asian</b>
<b>Observations</b>	49	49	49	49	49	49
<b>Mean</b>	11.79	17.41	14.36	17.13	14.02	17.11
<b>StdDev</b>	9.00	10.79	10.19	10.25	10.09	10.33
<b>Range</b>	17.53	28.71	24.17	23.69	18.45	26.42
<b>10 (percentile)</b>	3.15	3.63	3.51	5.10	4.40	4.22
<b>50 (percentile)</b>	10.27	17.42	13.24	16.49	12.58	17.17
<b>90 (percentile)</b>	20.68	32.34	27.68	28.79	22.85	30.64

Whites, Asians and AW have lower contact with Latino/as than Blacks, BW, and BA. Black Americans have the highest amount of contact with Latino/as out of any other group. In this respect, these patterns suggest Latino/as are in many ways a buffer group between groups in the racial hierarchy (O'Brien 2008). Thus groups on the lower end of the racial hierarchy may be exiting isolated neighborhoods and facilitating neighborhood diversity through contact with Latino/as.

#### *Overview*

Residential outcomes for multiracials are different from those of their parent groups and multiracial outcomes vary across type of multiracial combination. BWs have more contact with Whites than Blacks have with Whites. But they also have more contact with Blacks than Whites in the average city. Additionally BWs experience nearly identical contact patterns as Blacks when it comes to contact with Asians and Latino/as. Both Blacks and BWs experience low contact with Asians and higher contact with Latino/as. So while BWs have more contact with Whites than with Blacks, they “look” more like Blacks when it comes to their contact with non-White groups. On the opposite

end, AWs “look” the most like Whites in their contact patterns. AWs have more contact with Whites than any other group. And although AWs have more contact with Asians than any other group’s contact with Asians, AWs have more contact with Latino/as than with Asians. This is surprising as we may think of multiracials as living between their parent groups but this is not the case. Yet like Whites, AWs have the least amount of contact with Blacks. Their contact with Blacks is the lowest out of the multiracial groups. BAs on the other hand have the second lowest level of contact with Whites and the highest contact with Blacks out of all of the groups in the analysis. They experience more contact with Asians than BWs and nearly identical contact to Asians as AWs. Lastly, BAs have the highest contact with Latino/as out of the other multiracial groups.

All groups vary in their contact with themselves and to other groups. For example, BWs and Asians find themselves in the middle while AWs consistently remain close to Whites and have low contact with other groups. Additionally, the variation in contact patterns in and among groups revealed patterns such as how Blacks have far more variation in their contact scores than do Whites. This suggests that Blacks live in more diverse neighborhoods than do Whites. Again, overall contact patterns proved a broad overview of which groups are living with whom when all groups are present in the analysis.

### **Neighborhood Diversity Index**

Incorporating a neighborhood diversity index provides insight into the level of diversity each group is experiencing at the neighborhood level in comparison to the overall city level. Table 6.5 provides summary scores of the diversity for the average

city. In the average city, Whites experience the least amount of diversity out of all of the groups. Asians and BAs experience the highest levels of diversity in the average city.

**Table 6.5 Overall Group Contact with Diversity**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Latino/as</b>	<b>Black-White</b>	<b>Asian-White</b>	<b>Black-Asian</b>
<b>Observations</b>	49	49	49	49	49	49	49
<b>Mean</b>	41.93	57.09	60.90	56.65	58.99	55.43	61.52
<b>StdDev</b>	12.55	13.57	7.92	8.56	9.08	10.20	9.62
<b>Range</b>	34.90	35.50	19.80	21.80	24.00	30.00	25.30
<b>10 (percentile)</b>	24.40	37.70	51.00	45.50	47.00	39.30	48.50
<b>50 (percentile)</b>	40.00	57.70	61.00	55.80	58.60	54.30	61.90
<b>90 (percentile)</b>	59.30	73.20	70.80	67.30	71.00	69.30	73.80

Given the contact patterns with Asians were so low for each group, we could anticipate that Asians were living in more diverse communities where no one group is heavily concentrated. BAs actually have the highest diversity score out of all groups. In the previous chapter, smaller size should result in the high levels of contact with Whites. However in the case of BAs, their smaller size may be working in a different way. Instead of White neighborhoods, they are living in more diverse spaces. This may mean that diversity is more desirable for this group rather than White neighborhoods. It is also may mean that this group is experiencing more housing constraints in White neighborhoods resulting in a greater presence in diverse ones.

AWs experience the least amount of diversity in the average city out of the multiracial groups and the second lowest diversity score out of the single-race groups. AWs diversity patterns suggest this group continues to “look” like Whites rather than Asians. Asians experience higher levels of diversity than both AWs and Whites. BWs experience nearly identical levels of diversity in the average city when compared to their Black counterpart. BW and Black Americans live in more diverse neighborhoods than Whites. These two groups are often discussed in tandem as a reflection of the new direction of America’s landscape. With each sharing identical scores on the diversity index, a line of similarity is revealed that may be a clue into the residential outcomes of the future.

#### *City Level Diversity*

Overall, measures of neighborhood diversity help to answer the question, for the average person X (e.g. multiracial person), what kind of neighborhoods do they live in? However, if a city is not diverse, the options for living in a diverse neighborhood are different than for cities with more diversity. We can expect scores to be lower in cities that are less diverse—thus as cities are more predominately White, diversity scores for everyone decrease. Therefore, in this section a subset of cities is presented ranging proportion White and minority.

Table 6.7 provides diversity scores for a select group of cities from the larger 49-city sample. This is advantageous as we can gain a more in-depth understanding of the amount of diversity each group experiences in relation to the expected diversity in each city type. In the section to follow, in-depth analysis of this subset will take place but for

now, I will point out that although the larger patterns outlined previously hold true for the average city, there is still variation in and across cities. It is possible for some groups to have more diversity than would be expected based on the city level while others are not experiencing the diversity that is expected. Moreover, if there are multiple minority groups and they are not living next to Whites, Whites can have really low levels of diversity, living in all White neighborhoods. However, if the other non-White groups are evenly distributed amongst themselves, they would all experience higher levels of diversity than what is expected in the city. Conversely, in cities where Black and White segregation is high such as Chicago, other groups may experience higher levels of diversity than Blacks and Whites that remain isolated from each other. These potential trends outline the importance of demographic context in dynamics that reproduce differentiated outcomes regarding group inequality.

#### *Detailed City Analysis*

Table 6.7 also provides insight into variation in diversity experienced by each group. Each multiracial groups experiences higher levels of diversity from their single-race counterparts but this varies by city type.

**Table 6.6 Detailed City Sample: Contact with Whites**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Percent Population White in City</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Latino/a</b>	<b>Multiracial (total population)</b>	<b>Black- White</b>	<b>Asian- White</b>	<b>Black- Asian</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	74.2	24.4	46.5	36.6	47.3	41.0	58.7	36.9
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	78.7	34.0	53.3	40.7	55.3	51.6	65.7	43.7
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	76.7	15.4	54.3	34.5	52.4	45.7	63.1	36.8
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	82.0	12.5	59.3	48.5	48.0	36.8	73.9	22.5
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	65.8	20.3	36.6	26.5	45.0	38.4	49.2	33.5
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	85.4	57.0	62.2	68.0	68.8	65.1	70.4	65.2
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	57.4	16.6	27.4	16.2	42.0	38.3	50.1	29.7
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	87.2	50.9	63.6	60.3	70.7	67.8	78.4	60.3
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	78.6	14.7	58.6	31.3	45.5	43.5	65.0	29.1
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	68.6	12.0	36.1	22.2	34.3	37.3	52.3	18.2
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	59.3	25.0	33.0	30.0	41.1	38.8	44.9	33.0
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	82.9	64.0	68.8	64.6	74.9	72.2	76.4	68.2
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	57.9	30.7	36.3	28.6	42.6	38.2	44.5	35.0
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	64.1	29.8	34.3	32.8	48.5	47.2	52.6	36.2
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	68.5	21.1	48.4	36.0	47.2	42.5	56.1	36.2

For example, in a hyper-segregated city like Detroit, diversity scores are the lowest for each multiracial group but in a diverse city like Oakland, each multiracial group experiences their highest levels of diversity. There are also cities that represent the “new south” such as Atlanta, Houston and Charlotte that are offering diverse urban areas outside of the typical west coast cities. In these cities, each multiracial group is experiencing at least 50 percent diversity in their neighborhood. These are among the highest diversity scores outside of the west coast cities where the multiracial population is heavily concentrated. Although we know multiracials are more concentrated in the west and the south, we do not know if they are less segregated in these areas than in other regions of the country.

Moreover, it was unclear if city type reveals certain residential patterns for multiracial groups or if their patterns are the same for all cities in all places. With these data we see that in predominately White cities such as Lansing, Minneapolis, and Portland, each multiracials group exceeds the expected city level of diversity. But in more diverse cities such as Los Angeles, New York and Washington D.C., multiracial contact with diversity is lower than the expected city contact. However their contact with diversity in these cities is higher than their parent group’s contact. Yet in cities with a larger Black population (Oakland) or a large Asian population (Houston) each multiracial group has lower scores than Blacks or Asians. A variation in exposure to neighborhood diversity across cities shows that there is some fluidity to these residential patterns for multiracials. There is no one multiracial group that experiences more or less diversity than the other in every city. Yet in Detroit, Minneapolis and Portland we see



the largest margins of variation in diversity scores amongst multiracial groups. In a hypersegregated city like Detroit, AW experience more diversity than the other two groups. This may be due to their non-Black status, which does not regulate them to neighborhoods that are strictly Black or White. In Minneapolis and Portland, BA experience more diversity than each group for potentially a similar reason. In a predominately White city, they do not have claims to Whiteness and therefore may have fewer restrictions to live in a White neighborhood.

Each city type creates different levels of exposure to diversity for each group. Although they have different contact patterns from their single-race counterparts, these patterns operate on a sliding scale, which is in part impacted by the overall racial composition of the city. Unlike Whites, multiracials aren't disproportionately found in one type of city. But are they concentrated in a particular type of neighborhood?

One way to answer this question is to assess the distribution of groups across certain neighborhood types. This next section utilizes a simple, straightforward measure of neighborhood distribution to assess the types of neighborhoods individuals are living in.

### **Five Category Measure of Distribution by Neighborhood Proportion White**

A categorical neighborhood distribution scheme is useful in answering the question, "in the average city, what percent of group X are living in a neighborhood that is predominately comprised of the dominant group?" Given that these residential relationships are a new line of investigation, an established reference group is used to anchor this analysis. For this purpose these contact scores are measured based on the

estimated size of the White population as the reference point. Presumably White neighborhoods are the hardest to gain access to and predominately White neighborhoods are, in general more advantageous in terms of resources, housing values and neighborhood quality.

### *Contact with Whites—Detailed City*

Before reviewing these neighborhood distributions, we must first gain an understanding of the overall contact patterns in the city. These are similar to the contact patterns outlined in the beginning of the chapter however in this analysis, the focus is solely contact with Whites. In the sub-sample of cities, represented in Table 6.6 all Whites have above average contact with themselves as seen in the summary statistics presented previously. However, in Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Riverside, San Francisco and Washington DC, White population is 50 percent or lower. This means that in cities where the White population is not as prominent, the options for living in a diverse neighborhood are increased than for cities with larger White populations. For Portland, Lansing, and Minneapolis, where the White population is 80 percent or higher, inevitably limiting the potential for experiencing diversity in the city. Black contact with Whites in these cities is at least 20 percent lower than the expected contact with the White population. Cities where Blacks have the least amount of contact with Whites are Chicago, Detroit, Newark, and New York. Asian contact with Whites in these cities is higher than Black contact with Whites but lower than Whites contact with themselves.

**Table 6.7 City Level Diversity**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>City Level Diversity</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Latino/a</b>	<b>Multiracial (total population)</b>	<b>Black- White</b>	<b>Asian- White</b>	<b>Black- Asian</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	72.8	40.0	43.0	64.4	58.6	52.9	53.7	55.9	54.2
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	63.3	34.6	53.1	60.3	60.7	53.3	55.6	50.3	58.0
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	73.4	36.8	30.5	58.4	47.7	52.1	51.6	53.6	51.2
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	68.6	28.0	22.1	53.2	45.4	38.1	39.3	41.2	35.7
<b>Houston, TX</b>	81.4	49.8	57.7	69.6	52.3	62.8	63.9	65.2	67.2
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	39.9	27.1	60.6	55.5	50.8	49.6	54.9	48.1	54.4
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	82.4	57.8	60.4	64.3	47.0	64.3	65.5	63.6	66.3
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	37.9	24.1	59.3	51.9	54.1	45.2	49.2	37.8	52.2
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	73.6	34.3	44.0	56.0	55.6	53.0	52.9	50.6	55.3
<b>New York, NY</b>	85.6	47.1	52.5	63.1	57.0	62.8	59.6	59.5	69.1
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	85.6	59.6	74.1	68.3	69.5	71.4	73.6	73.6	69.6
<b>Portland, OR</b>	42.2	32.6	57.1	51.0	51.7	44.7	48.8	43.3	52.9
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	76.7	56.4	72.0	73.6	56.8	68.0	70.0	69.6	73.4
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	79.3	53.4	72.0	64.5	64.1	64.8	66.0	63.2	68.6
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	79.1	49.3	46.0	67.1	65.6	59.7	58.8	63.7	58.0

In Detroit, Asians have nearly the same amount of contact with Whites as the expected White population. Lieberman (1980) argues that White contact with Whites will always be high and minority groups contact with Whites can be high as well but only if Whites can maintain majority contact with themselves.

Throughout each measure of contact thus far, it is evident that Whites continue to maintain contact with themselves and distance from Blacks. Asians, Latino/as and multiracial groups have more contact with Whites but AW are reported as exceeding the expected contact with Whites in the average city and in this detailed subset. AW have the highest contact with Whites in every city out of any multiracial group. BW contact with Whites is similar to Asian contact with Whites except in cities with larger Black or Asian populations (Detroit, LA, Newark, and San Francisco). In addition, BW have higher contact with Whites than Blacks experience. BA contact patterns with Whites are between Blacks and Asian contact in most cities. However they have higher contact with Whites in San Francisco and Los Angeles than Asians and Blacks. BA have the same amount of contact with Whites as Asians do in Oakland and Portland. The context of the city and the population within the city matter for the residential opportunity afforded to each group.

#### *Five Category Neighborhood Distribution*

Transitioning to investigate the specific neighborhood type (proportion White) each group is experiencing in each city, it is evident that the contact patterns reflect the summary patterns that are presented in previous sections. However these patterns are

different for each group and differ amongst multiracial groups. These patterns also differ by city type (e.g. diverse, predominately White).

Table 6.8 shows what when the percent White in the city is below 50 percent, less than 50 percent of Whites live in neighborhoods that are 80-100 percent White. This is the case in Houston where the White population is 43 percent of the total ethnic composition of the city, which results in only 33 percent of Whites living in predominately White neighborhoods. This is contrasted in cities like Minneapolis where 82 percent of the ethnic composition of the city is comprised of the White population, resulting in 80 percent of Whites residing in neighborhoods that are 80-100 percent White. Cities such as Chicago and Detroit have a long legacy of residential outcomes that result in hypersegregation. These patterns are also reflected in this neighborhood distribution measure. In Detroit in particular, the proportion White in the city is just above 50 percent. However, 72 percent of Whites live in 80-100 percent White neighborhoods. Thus, the social context of the city matters just as much as the racial composition of the city and these patterns are to be taken into consideration when examining segregation.

For Black contact, the Black population consistently has lower contact with Whites than what is expected based on the city proportion White. This is especially evident in hypersegregated cities like Chicago and Detroit. However this is also evident in Newark and New York where the proportion White population in each city is below 50 percent. This signals that while there may be greater options to live in a more diverse neighborhood, those options are not equally experienced by all groups. In New York, 81

**Table 6.8 White Contact with Whites, Distribution of Whites Over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>% Pop. White in City</b>	<b>White Contact with Whites</b>	<b>Whites in 0-19% White Areas</b>	<b>Whites in 20-39% White Areas</b>	<b>Whites in 40-59% White Areas</b>	<b>Whites in 60-79% White Areas</b>	<b>Whites in 80-100% White Area</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	74.2	3.2	6.5	12.8	26.3	51.3
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	78.7	1.6	5.4	9.9	21.6	61.5
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	76.7	2.2	5.1	11.2	26.5	55.1
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	82.0	2.6	3.7	6.1	15.8	72.0
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	65.8	5.3	11.0	18.0	32.6	33.1
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	85.4	0.1	1.5	5.6	20.3	72.5
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	57.4	9.6	15.1	22.1	35.2	18.0
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	87.2	.3	1.6	4.0	14.5	79.5
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	78.6	2.7	4.5	9.4	20.6	62.8
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	68.6	5.5	8.0	15.8	31.4	39.4
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	59.3	5.6	16.5	23.5	34.5	19.9
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	82.9	0.1	0.9	5.2	27.4	66.4
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	57.9	6.3	18.8	26.6	28.1	20.3
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	64.1	3.9	12.2	22.0	33.6	28.3
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	68.5	3.3	8.8	17.8	33.9	36.1

percent of the Black population resides in neighborhoods that are 0-20 percent White or predominately Black. And although in the majority of the cities, Black contact with Whites is lower than the expected, contact is higher in cities like Portland and Riverside. However Table 6.9 shows the pattern remains that most Black Americans are concentrated in predominately Black neighborhoods, but experience more variation in their distribution along the five cut-off points than Whites.

According to Table 6.10 Asian neighborhood distribution reveals that Asians live in more diverse neighborhoods than Whites but live in more White neighborhoods than Blacks. In the majority of the cities, Asians reside in cities that are 20-40 and 40-60 percent White. However in Los Angeles, 50 percent of Asians live in neighborhoods that are less than 20 percent White. Moreover in cities with high levels of segregation between Blacks and White, such as Detroit, Asians live closer to Whites than to Blacks. This is the same case for Latino/as. Thus in places like Detroit, where the options are essentially Black or White neighborhoods, White neighborhoods become the more desired option. In Table 6.11, Latino/as, much like Asians, do not exceed the expected contact with Whites and they are more concentrated in neighborhoods that are 40 percent White or less.

In cities that have lower White populations such as Houston, Los Angeles, Riverside and Washington DC, Latino/as are concentrated in neighborhoods that are 0-20 percent White. In predominately White cities like Portland and Minneapolis, Latino/as live in neighborhoods that are predominately White. Latino/as, like Asians live in more diverse neighborhoods and are dispersed around the five categories, though they are slightly more concentrated on the lower end of the category distribution. Thus they are living in slightly less White neighborhoods than Asians but more White than Blacks. This pattern suggests that in this subset of cities, Latino/as stand as the buffer group and the middle-ground between non-White minority groups in the study.



**Table 6.9 Black Contact with Whites, Distribution over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>% Pop. White in City</b>	<b>Black Contact with Whites</b>	<b>Blacks in 0-19% White Areas</b>	<b>Blacks in 20-39% White Areas</b>	<b>Blacks in 40-59% White Areas</b>	<b>Blacks in 60-79% White Areas</b>	<b>Blacks in 80-100% White Areas</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	24.4	57.8	16.0	12.8	9.5	3.9
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	34.0	38.2	23.5	17.4	13.8	7.2
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	15.4	73.4	10.0	8.1	6.2	2.3
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	12.5	80.3	8.0	5.1	4.1	2.5
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	20.3	62.0	18.6	11.3	6.7	1.5
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	57.0	3.5	19.1	28.4	35.0	14.0
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	16.6	69.7	14.7	9.1	5.6	1.0
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	50.9	16.5	21.6	20.2	23.5	18.2
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	14.7	76.3	9.6	7.0	4.8	2.3
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	12.0	81.1	9.1	5.1	3.6	1.2
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	25.0	47.9	30.2	14.7	6.3	0.8
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	64.0	1.6	11.1	22.6	44.0	20.7
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	30.7	34.5	36.7	19.7	7.8	1.3
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	29.8	43.3	23.9	17.9	12.3	2.6
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	21.1	62.5	16.2	10.9	8.1	2.3

**Table 6.10 Asian Contact with Whites, Distribution of Asians over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>% Pop. White in City</b>	<b>Asian Contact with Whites</b>	<b>Asians in 0-19% White Areas</b>	<b>Asians in 20-39% White Areas</b>	<b>Asians in 40-59% White Areas</b>	<b>Asians in 60-79% White Areas</b>	<b>Asians in 80-100% White Areas</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	46.5	20.1	23.9	23.7	10.8	
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	53.3	12.9	21.2	20.9	25.0	20.1
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	54.3	11.1	16.9	25.3	31.0	15.6
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	59.3	9.3	13.9	22.2	29.2	25.4
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	36.6	32.2	24.8	21.8	16.8	4.5
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	62.2	4.9	14.9	17.1	38.8	24.4
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	27.4	49.6	22.2	15.3	10.9	2.0
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	63.6	7.8	12.0	17.3	29.6	3.3
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	58.6	9.2	13.3	22.4	32.1	22.9
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	36.1	37.6	19.4	19.5	17.3	6.2
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	33.0	33.7	32.5	19.1	12.2	2.5
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	68.8	1.1	5.9	18.8	45.0	29.2
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	36.3	22.1	39.0	25.9	10.9	2.2
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	34.3	32.6	28.9	23.0	12.3	3.1
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	48.4	12.1	24.5	29.4	26.5	7.6

**Table 6.11 Latino/a Contact with Whites, Distribution of Latino/as over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>% Pop. White in City</b>	<b>Latino/a Contact with Whites</b>	<b>Latino/as in 0-19% White Areas</b>	<b>Latino/as in 20-39% White Areas</b>	<b>Latino/as in 40-59% White Areas</b>	<b>Latino/as in 60-79% White Areas</b>	<b>Latino/as 80-100% White Areas</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	36.6	39.0	20.1	15.6	15.5	9.8
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	40.7	31.1	21.5	17.9	17.2	12.4
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	34.5	40.8	20.3	15.9	14.8	8.1
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	48.5	25.6	22.8	9.2	15.6	26.9
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	26.5	52.8	19.9	13.2	10.6	3.5
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	68.0	1.3	9.8	21.2	33.5	34.2
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	16.2	71.7	14.7	8.0	4.8	0.8
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	60.3	9.3	17.1	17.4	25.8	30.4
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	31.3	47.1	19.4	13.8	10.6	9.1
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	22.2	63.0	13.9	10.6	9.0	3.6
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	30.0	41.7	21.7	17.6	11.2	2.4
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	64.6	3.9	10.0	20.6	40.0	25.5
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	28.6	41.9	30.5	17.8	8.3	1.5
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	32.8	39.2	25.0	18.2	13.5	4.2
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	36.0	33.2	25.3	20.5	15.5	5.5

### *Multiracial Neighborhood Distribution*

The proportion White in a city has strong implications for the residential patterns of multiracial groups. As shown in Table 6.12, in predominately White cities like Portland and Minneapolis, BW live closer to Whites. In Portland, 45 percent of BWs live in neighborhoods that are at least 60-80 percent White. Thirty-six percent of BWs live in neighborhoods that are above 80 percent White. In Minneapolis 40 percent of BW live in neighborhoods that are at least 80 percent White. If segregation between Blacks and Whites is high such as in New York and Detroit, at least 40 percent of BW live in neighborhoods that are 0-20 percent White.

In Table 6.13, all but two cities (Portland and Minneapolis), the AW contact with Whites exceeds the expected contact with Whites in the city. In Detroit, AWs exceed the expected contact with Whites by the highest margin. Thus in a city where there are not options for integration, contact with Whites increases dramatically. In general, AWs remain closer to Whites, residing primarily in neighborhoods that are 60-80 percent White. Yet in cities like Los Angeles and Riverside, both cities with substantial non-White populations, AW are nearly non-existent in predominately White neighborhoods. Again, demographic context matters in residential patterns for multiracial groups. AWs do live in “Whiter” neighborhoods in most cities than is the case for Asians. AWs continue to pattern after the residential distribution of the White population but this, too,

**Table 6.12 Black-White Contact with Whites, Distribution of Black-White over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>% Pop. White in City</b>	<b>White Mean Contact with Whites</b>	<b>0-19% White</b>	<b>20-39% White</b>	<b>40-59% White</b>	<b>60-79% White</b>	<b>80-100% White</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	41.0	32.5	17.6	18.7	19.2	12.0
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	51.6	17.5	20.0	19.1	21.6	21.8
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	45.7	26.9	14.7	19.1	24.0	15.3
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	36.8	44.5	12.9	11.0	14.2	17.4
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	38.4	32.5	21.3	20.2	18.2	7.8
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	65.1	1.5	11.3	23.4	36.1	27.8
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	38.3	31.4	21.0	21.5	21.1	4.9
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	67.8	4.6	11.6	14.8	29.4	39.6
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	43.5	34.0	13.2	15.7	17.7	19.3
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	37.3	40.0	14.1	16.2	19.8	9.9
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	38.8	23.2	30.5	25.6	17.1	3.5
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	72.2	0.5	4.7	13.7	45.1	35.9
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	38.2	22.0	34.3	26.4	14.4	2.8
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	47.2	17.4	20.4	27.7	25.8	8.8
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	42.5	27.6	19.5	20.6	22.7	9.7

is dependent upon ethnic composition of the city in the ways in which this pattern plays out. And unlike BW, AW live in closer proximity to Whites in nearly every city type.

The BA population is different still. They have the least amount of contact with Whites than the other two multiracial groups. According to Table 6.14, BA are dispersed across the five neighborhood types more so than BW and AW. They are the most likely out of the multiracial groups to live in 0-20 percent White neighborhoods. This is the most pronounced in New York, Newark and Detroit—places where Black and White segregation is high. BA have the smallest representation in 80-100 percent White neighborhoods out of the other two multiracial groups. It is only in the majority White cities of Portland and Minneapolis are they in predominantly White neighborhoods. BA are dual minority status multiracials. They are not making a claim to Whiteness as a component of their identity, which may have implications for their lack of prominence in predominately White neighborhoods. Additionally, they are the most widely distributed across neighborhood types, reflecting a common pattern of neighborhood diversity that is less common for their other multiracial counterparts.

### *Overview*

BW reflect this intermediary space between Blacks and Whites but one that is on a sliding scale depending on the size of the Black or White population. Their patterns are at times a symbolic and physical representation of the social distance between these two groups. BW are truly the middle ground when compared to these two groups. On the other hand, there are AW multiracials who in many ways reflect an honorary White

**Table 6.13 Asian-White Contact with Whites, Distribution of Asian-White over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>% Pop. White in City</b>	<b>White Contact with Whites</b>	<b>0-19% White</b>	<b>20-39% White</b>	<b>40-59% White</b>	<b>60-79% White</b>	<b>80-100% White</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	58.7	11.1	13.8	20.4	29.4	25.3
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	65.7	5.8	11.9	16.6	28.4	37.3
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	63.1	6.0	11.0	21.6	33.7	27.7
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	73.9	3.3	5.3	11.8	25.1	54.4
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	49.2	16.5	20.0	24.4	27.8	11.3
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	70.4	3.0	7.6	14.1	33.6	41.7
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	50.1	15.7	18.7	24.1	31.9	9.5
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	78.4	1.4	4.1	7.8	26.1	60.7
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	65.0	7.1	9.8	17.7	29.6	35.8
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	52.3	17.9	14.2	21.1	29.9	16.9
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	44.9	16.5	28.1	24.9	24.6	5.9
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	76.4	0.3	2.0	9.4	41.1	47.3
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	44.5	13.1	30.3	31.7	20.3	4.7
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	52.6	10.0	19.4	28.8	30.5	11.2
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	56.1	6.6	17.4	28.0	34.4	13.7

**Table 6.14 Black-Asian Contact with Whites, Distribution of Black-Asian over Five Categories of Block-Level Percent White**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>% Pop. White in City</b>	<b>White Contact with Whites</b>	<b>0-19% White</b>	<b>20-39% White</b>	<b>40-59% White</b>	<b>60-79% White</b>	<b>80-100% White</b>
<b>Atlanta, Ga</b>	53.7	36.9	36.7	18.5	18.7	17.5	8.6
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	64.3	43.7	25.4	23.1	20.4	17.4	13.7
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	56.5	36.8	38.4	15.2	16.9	20.9	8.7
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	52.2	22.5	63.5	11.6	7.9	11.4	5.5
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.5	33.5	38.6	22.4	19.8	15.1	4.1
<b>Lansing, MI</b>	81.1	65.2	2.3	10.6	18.8	40.0	28.2
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.3	29.7	45.5	20.8	17.7	13.3	2.7
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	82.2	60.3	14.1	11.7	14.0	27.1	33.1
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	56.1	29.1	50.8	17.4	13.1	10.2	8.4
<b>New York, NY</b>	41.3	18.2	70.8	11.3	8.4	6.9	2.5
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	43.1	33.0	31.0	34.4	21.4	11.3	1.9
<b>Portland, OR</b>	79.8	68.2	2.3	5.7	18.2	45.7	28.2
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	41.8	35.0	25.9	35.7	26.5	11.0	1.0
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	48.8	36.2	32.8	23.8	23.5	16.1	3.7
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	49.2	36.2	36.6	20.6	18.2	17.2	7.5



status (Bonilla-Silva 2004). This group is the closest to Whites in all aspects of contact and remains close to Whites in nearly every neighborhood type. BA are a group that experiences the most diversity of all multiracial groups and in comparison to their parent groups. They are also the least likely to live in predominantly White spaces. This could be a result of their part Black identity that limits their access or a lack of a White identity that would promote exploration into neighborhoods without a prominent White community. Or BA as a dual minority status group seek out more diverse spaces in general.

### **Place Variation**

Throughout this analysis two patterns are clear: 1) overall residential patterns of contact hold up across cities, consistently reflecting the assumptions about general patterns of race relations; however 2) the way these patterns play out in cities of a particular type are more or less pronounced. These differences reflect an aspect of fluidity in race relations that is under theorized in the literature. In Portland and Detroit, Whites have high levels of contact with themselves that exceed the overall city proportion White. This is the same in Portland, although, Blacks live closer to Whites than in Detroit, resulting in different residential experience for Blacks in either city.

Moreover in a diverse city such as Los Angeles, the likelihood of any one group experiencing diversity is much higher than it is in Minneapolis. These patterns vary based on the social and demographic context of the city. While this variation provides complexity to the understanding of established residential patterns, it helps to solidify the place of various multiracials in the social hierarchy. Take BW for example. BW

contact with Blacks is greater in Detroit and lower in Portland. The distinction in Portland and Detroit is that the segregation between Blacks and Whites in Portland is not great but in Detroit it is far more pronounced. Thus BW are consistently in the middle, but the middle is relative. The residential patterns outlined in this chapter are on a sliding scale, reflecting that the U.S. racial structure is not a monolith. Instead it is simultaneously rigid in its overarching patterns but fluid in the ways they play out across contexts. Thus location is not a trivial question, but has its ramifications far beyond the simple description of where groups live.

## **Conclusion**

When examining various contact measures, it becomes evident that multiracial residential outcomes are distinct from their single-race counterparts but vary across multiracial groups. AW consistently have the highest contact with Whites out of any group in the analysis and across most city types. BA experienced the least amount of contact with Whites and the most amount of contact with Blacks, but were dispersed in more diverse neighborhoods than the other two multiracial groups. The contact patterns of BW often resemble those of Asians and Latino/as. BW are in the middle in contact patterns amongst multiracial groups and share contact patterns with the groups in the “racial middle” (O’Brien 2008). These patterns also varied across region and city type.

## CHAPTER VII

### LIVING UNEVEN

Residential segregation has been the subject of extensive research for many years, and a number of different measures of segregation have been developed over time. Among the most common are the measures for uneven distribution, namely, the index of dissimilarity. This chapter follows in this tradition while offering an intervention in these traditional measures, developed by Fossett and Zang (2011).

In the previous chapter, we investigated multiracial residential segregation where the base line were the counts for all groups in the analysis. In this chapter, I restrict the analysis to only a two-group comparison, utilizing traditional measures of uneven distribution. Two-group comparisons, or pairwise comparisons are advantageous for this level of analysis as they aid in providing a more careful look at segregation when only the two groups of interest are present (e.g. segregation between Blacks and whites when only Blacks and whites are present). Reardon and Firebaugh (2002) note that all major reviews of segregation indexes limit their discussion to dichotomous measures of segregation in this same fashion (e.g. Duncan and Duncan, 1955; James and Taeuber, 1985; Massey and Denton, 1988; White, 1986; Zoloth, 1976; Massey and Lundy 1996). Thus, this chapter presents the segregation scores for each multiracial group in comparison to each of their parent groups. Utilizing revamped versions of traditional measures of uneven distribution; the scores presented in this chapter are unseen in previous work. These new scores will offer insights not only to patterns of segregation

unfamiliar to the broader literature but also provide alternative methodological options for the investigation of America's ever changing racial landscape.

Before tackling empirical findings, I present a brief discussion of the issues with the traditional approach to measuring segregation between two groups. Recall in the methods chapter a detailed discussion of the methodological critiques of the traditional measures of unevenness. This section seeks to act as a brief refresher as to those arguments, offer a productive alternative to reconcile them and examples of why this alternative measure is ideal for this study in particular.

### **Leaving Biases at the Door: Measures of Uneven Distribution**

#### *Battle of the Indices*

In general, measures of unevenness provide us with information on a two-group comparison in the city. They indicate a group's departure from evenness in that two-group comparison. The most notable comparison is the uneven distribution of Blacks within and across U.S. cities (Massey and Denton 1993; Wilson 1987). These comparisons are investigated utilizing a measure known as the *index of dissimilarity* (D). Conceptually dissimilarity measures the percentage of a group's population that would have to change residence for each neighborhood to have the same percentage of that group in the neighborhood. D measures group difference in experiencing any departure from even distribution. D is the most widely used measure in segregation research but D is not without its limitations. In particular, D is unable to handle a comparison between groups that differ drastically in size and over smaller spatial units such as census blocks. Thus D "breaks down" in a sense, reporting scores that are at times volatile and

untrustworthy. This limitation made research on the segregation of small population nearly inconceivable and thus under-perused.

The *separation index* (V) is another widely used measure of unevenness that is well documented as reliable in the investigation of residential segregation among groups. V can be calculated in similar ways to D with similar interpretations. However while D is the most popular measure used in residential segregation, V provides substantial technical advantages and interpretive power over D. Namely, V does better to handle smaller populations and spatial units. Unlike D, V signals *residential polarization*, which is substantively important as it represents “prototypical” examples of severe segregation. Polarization indicates that the two groups live apart in neighborhoods that differ fundamentally on ethnic composition. This difference is important, as D will indicate there is segregation even when there is not polarization. As a result D can be telling us there is segregation when in fact the neighborhoods of these two groups aren’t that fundamentally different on racial/ethnic composition.

V offers more technical superiority and substantive interpretation and thus is the primary measure is discussed in this chapter. On occasion, D is discussed to reaffirm that V is the desirable measure for this line of investigation. V is always lower than D, thus a high score for V is between 40-50 rather than 70-100 for D in their conventional form.

#### *Conventional Measures of Unevenness and Their Discontents*

As stated in the methods chapter, it is well documented that all popular indices of uneven distribution have inherited upward bias. This quirk of the measures becomes especially concerning when the populations are small. Smaller populations can make

index scores untrustworthy and misleading primarily due to the inflation of scores.

However, this bias can be rectified through a “difference of means” calculation.

This calculation of the difference in means eliminates bias in these conventional segregation indices—resulting in the unbiased indices. Conventional measures count the people as having contact with themselves in the neighborhood, which creates an upward bias considering a person can never avoid having contact with themselves. A simple solution is to eliminate the reference individual from the calculation. Logically this makes sense, as the individual is the reference point and should not be included in the calculation of who lives in the individual’s own neighborhood. Removing the referenced individual rids the score of the problematic upward bias that becomes worse when the counts are small. The removal of bias also decreases the scores when compared to their conventional calculation. The unbiased version of these measures ( $D'$ ) ( $V'$ ) is featured in the analysis.

### **Segregation Beyond Black and White**

In this section measures of uneven distribution are conducted in a pairwise comparison. Three sets of comparisons are assessed for each multiracial group—segregation between parent groups (e.g. whites and Blacks), segregation between each parent group and the multiracial group (e.g. whites and BW, Blacks and BW). Summary scores as well as detailed city comparisons of the full 49 cities in the overall analysis are presented. I also present summary statistics on regional variation for select segregation measures. Region is a proxy for many other variables such as diversity, relative size and recent arrival of minority populations. Because this analysis is working with only 49

cities that met a specific threshold for each multiracial population, they are all large cities so breaking them down by size will not provide any insights. Thus region is a way to understand variation across these cities and their varied racial and ethnic contexts.

## **Black-White Multiracial (BW) Segregation**

### *White-Blacks Segregation*

Segregation between Blacks and whites is the most well documented segregation relationship. Systematically, segregation is high among this group comparison across the full set of cities as outline in Table 7.1. However, the range found in the summary statistics outlined in Table 7.2 show there is a lot of variation in this pattern across cities. For example, in Table 7.2 segregation between Blacks and whites is 72 in Detroit, an extremely high score for V signaling extreme levels of residential polarization. Blacks and whites live in neighborhoods that are fundamentally different on ethnic composition. This is also the case for cities like New York, Newark and Chicago. However, in cities like Honolulu and Santa Ana, segregation between Blacks and whites is in the single digits, signaling very low residential polarization between Blacks and whites in these cities. Regional implications are accounted for in the comparison of each group. These data show that the summary statistics varies by region. Each region varies in score and range of scores. V' is lowest in the West and highest in the North.

Moreover, featured in these tables are components of a *polarization index*. This index indicates what percentage of each group in the pairwise comparison live in neighborhoods that are least 65 percent of their same group. The overall polarization

**Table 7.1 Black-White Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	63.18	10.57	30.35	47.96	63.10	78.31
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	41.81	18.24	53.63	14.01	43.07	67.65
% Whites in 65% White Areas	49	93.04	4.78	13.66	84.93	93.82	98.58
% Black in 65% Black Areas	49	39.34	25.15	73.12	2.57	41.48	75.69
Polarization Index	49	39.33	25.13	73.12	2.57	41.48	75.69
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	57.28	14.21	37.51	34.32	57.41	71.84
Central	7	56.26	16.38	43.28	31.93	62.42	75.21
South	18	46.82	9.95	28.00	30.57	47.43	58.56
West	17	24.19	12.73	33.73	9.31	22.65	43.05
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	57.52	20.31	56.59	23.79	54.98	80.38
Central	7	55.63	22.72	63.83	21.35	63.21	85.18
South	18	48.89	16.79	46.65	20.85	49.11	67.50
West	17	15.01	15.95	40.64	0.83	11.43	41.48



score, generally takes the lower of these two scores to provide the overall polarization index. These measures are almost perfectly correlated with  $V'$ .  $V'$  indicates groups live in fundamentally different kinds of neighborhoods meaning the ethnic composition on average for one group is totally different than the ethnic composition for another group. The polarization index crystalizes this point by indicating just how much these two groups live in neighborhoods where they are ethnically isolated. Essentially, the polarization is answering the question, to what extent do both groups live in same group neighborhoods?

In this comparison, the polarization scores are essentially examining the prevalence of living in predominately white areas for whites and the prevalence of living in predominately Black areas for Blacks. If there is a lot of segregation, these scores will both be high—most whites would live in majority white areas and most Blacks would live in majority Black areas.

For example, in Table 7.2, Detroit, 90 percent of whites live in areas that are 65 percent white or more, while 85 percent of Blacks live in areas that are 65 percent Black, when those numbers are high, it means those two groups are polarized because they live primarily in areas where their group predominates. In Edison 23 percent of Blacks live in neighborhoods that are 65 percent black, which means that means 77 percent are living in neighborhoods that are less than 65 percent Black. This is indicating that this is something short of extreme polarization in this city. Table 7.1 indicates that polarization is the lowest in the West by a significant margin for this pairwise comparison.

**Table 7.2 Detailed City Analysis of the White-Black Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
NORTH					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	72.7	54.1	95.9	50.9	50.9
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	63.8	44.6	93.1	43.9	43.9
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	63.2	34.3	96.6	23.8	23.8
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	76.4	57.4	96.9	55.0	55.0
<b>New York, NY</b>	81.6	71.8	93.3	80.4	80.4
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	81.2	71.7	93.5	76.9	76.9
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	78.3	67.0	94.0	71.8	71.8
CENTRAL					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	80.7	72.5	95.3	75.7	75.7
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	77.0	63.8	94.0	64.5	64.5
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	66.8	44.2	93.5	40.6	40.6
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	83.1	75.2	90.4	85.2	85.2
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	63.1	31.9	97.4	21.3	21.3
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	77.0	62.4	94.5	63.2	63.2
<b>Warren, MI</b>	67.7	43.7	96.6	38.9	38.9
SOUTH					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	66.7	53.8	84.1	63.6	63.6

**Table 7.2 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Austin, TX</b>	57.2	28.4	95.5	17.6	17.6
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	70.7	58.6	89.0	64.9	64.9
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	55.9	32.9	87.9	29.1	29.1
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	62.5	45.2	86.7	47.4	47.4
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	62.8	48.3	91.1	49.9	49.9
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	63.8	50.2	85.5	59.2	59.2
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	64.1	41.6	91.7	34.6	34.6
<b>Houston, TX</b>	68.4	54.9	88.8	59.2	59.2
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	62.9	47.0	91.2	46.5	46.5
<b>Miami, FL</b>	76.9	67.6	83.3	83.3	83.3
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	59.6	43.1	92.6	43.4	43.4
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	62.5	47.8	84.9	56.5	56.5
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	55.5	30.6	94.4	20.9	20.9
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	64.0	42.8	96.0	38.2	38.2
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	57.1	42.7	82.2	49.7	49.7
<b>Washington, DC</b>	68.9	56.5	86.9	67.5	67.5
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	67.9	50.7	92.7	48.6	48.6

**Table 7.2 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	46.4	12.1	98.7	0.8	0.8
<b>Denver, CO</b>	65.1	30.2	97.0	16.6	16.6
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	39.9	8.7	98.9	0.3	0.3
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	42.2	20.3	93.5	11.4	11.4
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	69.4	56.6	93.8	59.9	59.9
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	63.1	43.0	90.0	41.4	41.5
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	51.5	19.2	98.4	8.2	8.2
<b>Portland, OR</b>	53.8	14.0	99.3	2.6	2.6
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	52.9	26.5	92.2	14.3	14.3
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	60.4	28.5	95.4	16.5	16.5
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	57.0	27.2	97.5	18.0	18.0
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	61.7	37.2	97.6	30.8	30.8
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	51.7	15.1	98.6	3.0	3.0
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	48.0	9.3	99.7	1.7	1.7
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	56.5	22.7	98.1	10.9	10.9
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	48.8	14.0	97.9	1.1	1.1
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	47.4	26.4	83.1	18.4	18.4

### *White-BW Segregation*

Unlike Blacks, BW have just as much contact with whites as whites have with themselves on average, so as a result, the variance ratio scores are very low. Detroit is the only city with a V' score that is in double digits, with a 13 percent difference in average contact with whites in this pairwise comparison. All other cities have a score in the lower single digits. In cities like Portland and Honolulu V' is less than one percent. In addition, the difference in the scores reported between D' and V' is of stark difference. In the summary Table 7.3, the average score for D' is 35 while the average score for V' is only 4. In the city list, these differences are more apparent as V' is consistently lower than D' by a dramatic margin, signaling a “different story” for the residential experiences of BW depending upon the method that is used.

In comparison to segregation between Blacks and whites, white-BW segregation is significantly lower with virtually no polarization. Although there is regional variation captured in Table 7.3, showing the V' is highest in the North and West, polarization is almost never experienced. For example, in the Detroit, the city with the highest V' score, 99 percent of whites live in a neighborhood that are at least 65 percent white and only 8 percent of BW live in a neighborhood that is 65 percent BW. This is the highest polarization score for BW however, I can speculate that for BW, this is probably only happening in small blocks (remember a block is on average only 30-50 people to begin with) as there have not been any large blocks that are predominately multiracial in the analysis. Nonetheless, 8 percent signals that there is very low residential polarization between these groups in the city of Detroit. This pattern is carried throughout the list of

49 cities. Lastly, in Table 7.4, of the 49 cities, the polarization index is slightly higher in cities with larger Black populations suggesting a sliding scale of contact with whites rather than the same amount of contact across all cities.

### *Black-BW Segregation*

On average, BW experience a greater difference in their contact with Blacks than with whites. BW also experience greater polarization from Blacks than they do from whites. This holds true in every region. According to the summary statistics in Table 7.5 components of the polarization index show that 99 percent of Blacks live in a neighborhood that are 65 percent Black but only a only a small fraction of BW live on a block where BW are 65 percent of the population. So, while polarization is greater in this comparison, than the previous comparison, it is still not as high as the Black-white comparison.

While in the previous comparison between whites and BW, Detroit was the only city with a V' score in double digits; there are 12 cities (Boston, Edison, Nassau, Minneapolis, Miami, Denver, Phoenix, Portland, San Francisco, San Jose, Santa Ana, Seattle) in double digits for the Black-BW comparison as seen in Table 7.6. And in cities with larger white populations such as Portland and Santa Ana, polarization is the highest for this comparison. But again, BW multiracials are not experiencing extreme polarization in any of the 49 cities in Table 7.6.

**Table 7.3 White-BW Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	35.46	4.79	12.12	29.25	35.50	41.38
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	3.55	2.32	5.57	1.29	2.96	6.85
% Whites in 65% White Areas	49	99.97	0.02	0.04	99.95	99.98	99.99
% BW in 65% BW Areas	49	1.14	1.44	2.86	0.04	0.60	2.89
Polarization Index	49	1.14	1.44	2.86	0.04	0.60	2.89
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	5.44	1.48	3.86	3.20	5.69	7.07
Central	7	5.39	3.84	10.96	2.02	4.08	12.98
South	18	3.48	1.76	3.74	1.65	3.10	5.39
West	17	2.08	1.06	2.54	0.94	1.73	3.49
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	2.05	0.97	2.71	0.96	1.80	3.66
Central	7	2.49	2.74	7.59	0.04	1.69	7.63
South	18	1.07	0.92	2.17	0.08	0.93	2.26
West	17	0.30	0.49	0.89	0.00	0.17	0.89

**Table 7.4 Detailed City Analysis of the White-BW Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% BW in 65% BW areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>NORTH</b>					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	38.6	4.1	100.0	1.4	1.4
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	41.5	4.7	100.0	1.3	1.3
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	40.3	3.2	100.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	43.7	5.7	100.0	1.8	1.8
<b>New York</b>	41.4	6.5	99.9	2.3	2.3
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	38.9	6.9	100.0	2.9	2.9
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	40.8	7.1	100.0	3.7	3.7
<b>CENTRAL</b>					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	40.8	7.7	100.0	4.6	4.6
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	40.1	5.1	100.0	2.4	2.4
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	35.7	3.0	100.0	0.6	0.6
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	46.0	13.0	99.9	7.6	7.6
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	35.4	2.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	33.6	4.1	100.0	1.7	1.7
<b>Warren, MI</b>	37.2	2.8	100.0	0.5	0.5
<b>SOUTH</b>					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	42.0	5.4	100.0	1.6	1.6
<b>Austin, TX</b>	32.4	1.2	100.0	0.1	0.1



**Table 7.4 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% BW in 65% BW areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
Baltimore, MD	37.7	3.9	100.0	1.4	1.4
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	35.2	1.6	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	35.1	3.1	100.0	0.9	0.9
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	35.8	3.1	100.0	1.2	1.2
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	35.4	4.1	100.0	1.1	1.1
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	35.0	2.4	100.0	0.6	0.6
<b>Houston, TX</b>	37.9	4.5	100.0	1.5	1.5
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	34.5	1.9	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Miami, FL</b>	36.0	8.5	99.9	3.8	3.8
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	36.3	2.6	100.0	0.5	0.5
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	38.1	4.8	100.0	2.3	2.3
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	36.8	2.1	100.0	0.5	0.5
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	33.7	2.2	100.0	0.4	0.4
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	39.4	3.9	100.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Washington, DC</b>	35.5	4.9	100.0	1.8	1.8
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	39.1	2.3	100.0	0.3	0.3

**Table 7.4 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% BW in 65% BW areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	32.7	1.7	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Denver, CO</b>	33.7	1.9	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	18.9	0.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	31.1	1.6	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	31.9	4.8	99.9	2.0	2.0
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	33.2	3.5	100.0	0.9	0.9
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	32.8	1.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Portland, OR</b>	28.4	0.9	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	35.8	2.9	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	36.2	2.5	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	32.3	1.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	25.5	2.3	100.0	0.5	0.5
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	33.3	1.6	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	29.7	1.2	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	29.3	1.3	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	28.5	1.7	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	34.7	3.5	100.0	0.3	0.3

Lastly, if we compare the summary scores between  $D'$  and  $V'$  for this comparison in Table 7.5,  $D'$  gives an average value of 32 percent while  $V'$  is under 10.  $D'$  not only tells a “different story” in the reporting of scores but  $D'$  signals that BW experience higher levels of segregation from whites than they do from Blacks. However  $V'$  remains consistent, thus reporting the opposite relationship in comparison to  $D'$ . Again,  $D'$  break down and begin to report “flaky” scores when examining smaller populations in comparison to larger ones and when spatial units are small. For these reasons, it is advantageous to utilize the separation index for the investigation of multiracial residential segregation.

When comparing the segregation patterns of BW to their parent groups, it is evident that BW rarely live in neighborhoods where they are the majority. They experience greater differences in their contact with Blacks than they do with whites. However in either case, BW do not experience high levels of residential polarization. Their patterns are different from Black-white segregation where Blacks and whites experience more variability across region and in the larger city set. Lastly, in comparing  $D'$  and  $V'$ , even when  $V'$  is high, it is still lower than  $D'$ . There is more variability in  $V'$  than in  $D'$  as  $V'$  signals residential polarization. Thus in cities where uneven distribution as measured by  $D'$  is high, there may not be residential polarization which ultimately reduces the variability in the scores for  $D'$ .

**Table 7.5 Black-BW Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	32.06	5.58	12.83	26.15	31.50	38.98
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	8.18	2.91	8.08	4.15	8.01	12.23
% Black in 65% Black Areas	49	99.23	0.93	2.18	97.73	99.58	99.91
% BW in 65% BW Areas	49	4.48	2.33	5.81	1.75	4.27	7.56
Polarization Index	49	4.48	2.33	2.02	5.81	1.75	4.27
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	10.09	2.83	7.82	7.50	9.53	15.33
Central	7	8.53	1.59	4.69	6.24	8.61	10.92
South	18	5.84	2.03	5.71	3.18	5.74	8.90
West	17	9.73	2.60	7.77	6.41	9.25	14.17
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	5.52	2.24	5.90	3.44	5.16	9.35
Central	7	4.64	1.38	4.23	2.61	4.45	6.84
South	18	2.70	1.30	3.79	1.16	2.45	4.95
West	17	5.86	2.42	7.72	2.94	4.91	10.66

**Table 7.6 Detailed City Analysis of the Black-BW Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>% BW in 65% BW areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>NORTH</b>					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	40.4	10.7	99.5	5.2	5.2
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	31.5	7.5	99.7	3.7	3.7
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	35.3	11.9	99.5	7.6	7.6
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	45.2	15.3	99.6	9.3	9.3
<b>New York, NY</b>	39.0	8.1	99.9	3.6	3.6
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	36.2	9.5	99.8	5.8	5.8
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	35.6	7.6	99.8	3.4	3.4
<b>CENTRAL</b>					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	41.1	9.8	99.8	5.4	5.4
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	37.0	8.6	99.8	4.4	4.4
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	29.9	7.1	99.6	3.5	3.5
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	34.0	6.2	99.9	2.6	2.6
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	29.7	10.9	98.7	6.8	6.8
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	34.5	8.0	99.8	4.4	4.4
<b>Warren, MI</b>	34.2	9.1	99.6	5.3	5.3
<b>SOUTH</b>					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	29.2	3.2	100.0	1.3	1.3
<b>Austin, TX</b>	29.3	6.9	99.4	3.5	3.5

**Table 7.6 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>% BW in 65% BW areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	34.1	5.0	99.9	2.1	2.1
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	22.3	4.1	99.8	1.5	1.5
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	28.8	4.1	99.9	1.8	1.8
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	31.5	5.0	99.9	2.3	2.3
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	34.0	6.1	99.9	2.6	2.6
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	30.3	6.7	99.8	3.3	3.3
<b>Houston, TX</b>	31.9	5.5	99.9	2.7	2.7
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	34.9	6.0	99.9	3.2	3.2
<b>Miami, FL</b>	48.1	10.9	99.9	5.6	5.6
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	35.3	5.9	99.8	2.2	2.2
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	31.6	4.6	99.9	1.8	1.8
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	28.0	6.7	99.6	3.4	3.4
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	33.0	8.9	99.6	4.9	4.9
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	30.2	3.1	99.9	1.0	1.0
<b>Washington, DC</b>	32.3	4.1	99.9	1.2	1.2
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	38.1	8.3	99.8	4.3	4.3

**Table 7.6 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>% BW in 65% BW areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	27.0	8.9	97.7	4.8	4.8
<b>Denver, CO</b>	31.1	10.2	98.7	6.5	6.5
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	21.7	6.7	97.9	4.8	4.8
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	23.4	6.4	99.4	2.9	2.9
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	37.3	9.2	99.5	4.2	4.2
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	28.8	7.3	99.4	3.3	3.3
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	30.3	11.0	98.3	7.2	7.2
<b>Portland, OR</b>	30.6	14.2	95.8	11.0	11.0
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	30.1	9.3	99.2	4.9	4.9
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	26.1	9.0	98.8	5.4	5.4
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	28.7	9.2	98.6	4.9	4.9
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	33.0	12.2	98.0	7.5	7.5
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	32.7	12.7	97.7	7.8	7.8
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	31.2	14.7	97.0	10.7	10.7
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	28.7	10.7	97.8	6.7	6.7
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	17.5	7.3	97.4	4.7	4.7
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	26.4	6.2	99.5	2.4	2.4

## **Asian-White Multiracial (AW) Segregation**

### *Asian-White Segregation*

As can be seen in Table 7.7, segregation between Asian and whites is lower on average than the segregation between Blacks and whites. The average score for  $V'$  is 20 on average across these 49 cities. This is 20 points lower than the score on  $V'$  for the Black-white comparison. Moreover, when comparing the difference between  $D'$  and  $V'$ , the difference between these two comparisons is even greater. This is due in part because Asian-White segregation typically doesn't involve polarization as we will see in the 49 city distribution. Following the measures of uneven distribution, the polarization index also reveals large differences in the comparisons between Asians and Blacks in their contact with whites. For the Asian-white comparison, the polarization index is 13 percent whereas for the Black-white comparison it is 39 percent. Thus, Asian-white polarization is one-third that of Black-white polarization.

Regionally, Asian-white polarization is greatest in the West. This may be due to the large Asian populations found in cities in the West. Larger Asian populations increase the likelihood that Asians will reside in neighborhoods that predominately Asian. Drawing attention to the detailed scores in Table 7.8, New York, Oakland, Honolulu, San Jose, San Francisco and Los Angeles are the cities with the largest polarization scores signaling the Asian population in these cities are living in neighborhoods that are at least 65 percent Asian. These are places where there is a big enough Asian presence where adult Asians often live in neighborhoods that are predominately Asian.



**Table 7.7 Asian-White Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	50.69	5.44	13.36	44.22	51.56	57.58
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	20.34	8.22	22.10	11.32	18.50	33.42
% Whites in 65% White Areas	49	93.36	11.36	17.66	81.86	97.72	99.52
% Asian in 65% Asian Areas	49	13.56	16.52	36.81	1.70	7.58	38.51
Polarization Index	49	12.59	13.57	35.32	1.70	7.58	37.02
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	24.17	8.03	18.91	17.11	23.54	36.02
Central	7	16.84	4.32	10.71	12.25	16.28	22.95
South	18	17.50	6.47	15.17	10.33	17.13	25.50
West	17	23.22	9.88	22.05	11.37	28.68	33.42
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	13.98	12.07	33.41	3.61	11.42	37.02
Central	7	5.43	3.52	9.42	1.88	4.41	11.30
South	18	6.76	6.27	12.89	1.24	5.15	14.13
West	17	21.14	17.66	45.00	1.99	21.55	47.00

**Table 7.8 Detailed City Analysis of White-Asian Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
NORTH					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	56.5	23.5	97.2	11.4	11.4
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	54.0	17.2	98.8	5.5	5.5
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	61.5	34.2	93.3	22.8	22.8
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	52.9	17.4	97.9	3.6	3.6
<b>New York, NY</b>	54.9	36.0	89.6	37.0	37.0
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	48.2	17.1	97.5	5.3	5.3
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	54.8	23.6	97.7	12.2	12.2
CENTRAL					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	52.7	23.0	96.4	11.3	11.3
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	52.1	12.2	99.7	2.6	2.6
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	54.4	13.3	99.3	1.9	1.9
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	60.8	21.6	98.7	7.6	7.6
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	51.6	18.5	98.6	7.7	7.7
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	56.0	12.9	99.6	2.5	2.5
<b>Warren, MI</b>	58.0	16.3	99.2	4.4	4.4
SOUTH					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	57.6	25.5	97.0	14.1	14.1
<b>Austin, TX</b>	50.3	16.3	97.7	4.1	4.1

**Table 7.8 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	53.4	18.4	98.1	6.2	6.2
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	46.6	21.2	90.0	9.2	9.2
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	54.1	17.9	98.9	6.3	6.3
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	55.1	24.9	95.5	12.3	12.3
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	46.7	12.9	98.7	2.6	2.6
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	56.0	21.6	98.3	10.0	10.0
<b>Houston, TX</b>	58.4	33.5	94.1	25.3	25.3
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	48.8	10.9	99.4	1.7	1.7
<b>Miami, FL</b>	49.9	21.5	96.6	11.4	11.4
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	47.3	13.7	98.7	2.6	2.6
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	54.3	15.4	99.0	2.6	2.6
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	48.0	12.2	99.1	1.4	1.4
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	49.3	10.3	99.5	1.2	1.2
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	44.2	11.3	99.1	2.1	2.1
<b>Washington, DC</b>	45.0	10.0	93.2	7.8	7.8
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	48.2	8.3	99.7	0.8	0.8

**Table 7.8 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White areas</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	35.6	5.0	99.8	0.3	0.3
<b>Denver, CO</b>	44.2	11.4	99.3	2.9	2.9
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	47.0	30.6	34.0	81.6	34.0
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	36.8	12.9	94.4	2.3	2.3
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	54.0	37.5	82.5	47.0	47.0
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	48.7	30.7	77.2	38.5	38.5
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	45.4	11.6	99.2	2.0	2.0
<b>Portland, OR</b>	44.8	12.9	98.7	2.5	2.5
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	51.9	24.4	93.5	13.5	13.5
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	54.9	29.9	91.3	21.6	21.6
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	53.0	29.9	91.4	24.3	24.3
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	51.6	33.4	75.2	42.8	42.8
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	48.2	31.5	64.6	52.3	52.3
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	48.2	28.7	81.9	29.6	29.6
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	43.8	20.2	93.4	11.6	11.6
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	44.0	14.4	98.3	4.5	4.5
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	50.2	30.0	83.7	29.7	29.7

It is easy to see that Asian-white segregation only occasionally falls under polarization and when polarization is present it is never high but it is sometimes medium. There are only three cities, Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Jose that reach polarization scores of 40 or higher. Polarization scores of that kind are common for Blacks but are not for Asians. On average, Asian-white segregation is low and reaches greater polarization with the presence of a large Asian population. However, Asian-white segregation is significantly lower than Black-white segregation.

#### *White-AW Segregation*

Much like the white-BW comparison,  $V'$  is low and its range is very low reflecting low variability across cities for this segregation relationship outline in Table 7.9. Thus the difference in contact with whites between whites and AW is low. The polarization index is also low reaffirming the notion that AW experience little to no residential polarization from whites. And although the white-BW comparison revealed very low levels of polarization, these levels are lower still for AW. According to the polarization index, for the white-BW comparison, there were some cities where the polarization reached 10 percent.

**Table 7.9 White-AW Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	34.00	7.30	17.69	25.70	33.05	43.39
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	2.66	1.68	3.35	1.23	2.28	4.58
% Whites in 65% White Areas	49	99.88	0.69	0.06	99.93	99.99	100.00
% AW in 65% AW Areas	49	0.39	0.44	0.69	0.02	0.28	0.71
Polarization Index	49	0.39	0.44	0.69	0.02	0.28	0.71
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	2.93	0.90	2.51	2.01	2.68	4.58
Central	7	2.46	1.66	4.61	1.00	2.07	5.61
South	18	2.46	1.45	2.01	1.49	2.13	3.50
West	17	2.83	2.20	4.04	1.09	2.59	5.12
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	0.49	0.17	0.54	0.15	0.52	0.69
Central	7	0.31	0.28	0.78	0.00	0.27	0.78
South	18	0.46	0.52	0.64	0.07	0.34	0.71
West	17	0.32	0.48	0.82	0.00	0.21	0.82

**Table 7.10 Detailed City Analysis of White-AW Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White Areas</b>	<b>% AW in 65% AW Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
NORTH					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	45.1	2.1	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	35.9	2.2	100.0	0.5	0.5
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	43.4	2.7	100.0	0.5	0.5
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	52.4	4.6	100.0	0.7	0.7
<b>New York, NY</b>	40.8	3.6	100.0	0.5	0.5
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	42.5	3.0	100.0	0.6	0.6
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	38.3	2.4	100.0	0.6	0.6
CENTRAL					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	41.1	3.7	100.0	0.8	0.8
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	37.4	1.2	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	33.1	1.3	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	58.8	5.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	28.7	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	34.2	2.1	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Warren, MI</b>	43.7	2.3	100.0	0.3	0.3
SOUTH					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	37.8	2.4	100.0	0.6	0.6
<b>Austin, TX</b>	28.7	1.5	100.0	0.1	0.1

**Table 7.10 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White Areas</b>	<b>% AW in 65% AW Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	36.3	2.3	100.0	0.7	0.7
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	34.1	2.5	100.0	0.4	0.4
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	34.5	1.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	39.4	3.2	100.0	0.4	0.4
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	33.0	2.0	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	34.9	2.2	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Houston, TX</b>	40.0	3.5	100.0	0.7	0.7
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	32.8	1.8	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Miami, FL</b>	38.2	7.8	99.8	2.4	2.4
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	32.9	1.7	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	33.1	2.2	100.0	0.6	0.6
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	31.4	2.1	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	31.9	1.6	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	25.7	1.2	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Washington, DC</b>	25.7	1.2	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	34.6	2.1	100.0	0.5	0.5



**Table 7.10 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% White in 65% White Areas</b>	<b>% AW in 65% AW Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	26.0	1.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Denver, CO</b>	25.9	1.3	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	32.9	10.4	95.2	2.0	2.0
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	26.8	1.5	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	29.6	3.2	99.9	0.5	0.5
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	31.5	5.1	99.8	0.8	0.8
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	32.6	2.4	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Portland, OR</b>	23.1	1.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	34.2	2.9	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	30.8	2.8	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	29.0	2.6	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	21.3	1.8	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	27.9	2.9	99.9	0.3	0.3
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	32.1	3.2	100.0	0.3	0.3
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	24.0	1.5	100.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	23.1	1.5	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	25.9	3.0	99.9	0.3	0.3

However, for the AW comparison, there are only two cities that reached over one percent. This means that for the AW comparison with whites, there is absolutely no polarization. The only city where  $V'$  is in double digits is Honolulu which is an anomaly in many ways given it's unique history and a-typical ethnic composition.

Beyond this comparison, Table 7.10 shows  $V'$  and the polarization index reflect no polarization experienced in this comparison. However, if  $D'$  was used to evaluate this comparison, it would tell a different story than  $V$ . While  $D'$  scores white-AW segregation at a 34, meaning 34 percent of AW would have to move to white neighborhoods to achieve even distribution,  $V'$  is in single digits. Single digits on  $V'$  signals no residential polarization meaning contact with whites on average, is nearly the same as whites contact with themselves. This is yet another example of why  $D'$  should not be used in every segregation comparison.

#### *Asian-AW Segregation*

Table 7.11 states that on average, AW experience greater segregation from Asians than from whites.  $V'$  for the Asian-AW comparison is 13 points higher than for white-AW comparison. On average, AW multiracials are living closer to whites than to Asians. Regionally,  $V'$  is highest in the Central part of the country and lowest in the West. These regional patterns are different than the patterns in the previous two comparisons. Again this variation may be in part to the presence of larger Asian populations in different parts of the country.

**Table 7.11 Asian-AW Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	37.72	7.95	19.63	26.39	37.31	46.03
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	15.70	7.93	14.87	8.05	14.28	22.92
% Asian in 65% Asian Areas	49	97.63	2.17	3.66	95.84	98.08	99.50
% AW in 65% AW Areas	49	10.45	8.06	15.22	2.70	9.78	19.93
Polarization Index	49	10.45	8.06	15.22	2.70	9.78	19.93
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	17.95	6.94	19.91	11.18	16.21	31.09
Central	7	25.54	13.71	38.55	17.31	22.10	55.86
South	18	15.35	4.14	11.88	9.63	14.72	21.51
West	17	11.08	3.81	9.66	6.36	11.87	16.02
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	11.77	6.30	17.86	4.81	10.20	22.67
Central	7	20.11	14.88	41.58	11.66	16.04	53.24
South	18	10.41	4.00	11.10	4.74	9.93	15.84
West	17	5.98	4.15	11.28	1.12	4.73	12.40

**Table 7.12 Detailed City Analysis of Asian-AW Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>%AW in 65% AW Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
NORTH					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	37.3	12.0	99.0	6.9	6.9
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	45.0	22.9	98.4	17.9	17.9
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	47.3	15.5	99.5	10.9	10.9
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	57.6	31.1	98.3	22.7	22.7
<b>New York, NY</b>	45.9	11.2	99.6	4.8	4.8
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	44.3	16.8	98.7	9.7	9.7
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	41.8	16.2	98.8	10.2	10.2
CENTRAL					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	42.8	18.1	98.7	11.7	11.7
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	43.5	22.1	97.0	16.0	16.0
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	39.1	17.6	97.3	12.2	12.2
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	65.6	55.9	96.2	53.2	53.2
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	40.1	17.3	98.2	11.7	11.7
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	41.0	22.1	96.2	17.4	17.4
<b>Warren, MI</b>	50.0	25.6	97.0	18.5	18.5
SOUTH					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	38.8	13.8	99.0	8.6	8.6
<b>Austin, TX</b>	33.1	13.4	97.5	8.5	8.5

**Table 7.12 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>%AW in 65% AW Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	37.0	15.7	97.9	10.1	10.1
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	33.4	9.6	99.2	4.7	4.7
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	41.3	16.5	98.3	10.7	10.7
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	39.1	14.5	98.8	9.1	9.1
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	37.3	15.9	98.0	10.3	10.3
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	40.4	19.2	98.1	14.1	14.1
<b>Houston, TX</b>	40.0	12.6	99.2	6.8	6.8
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	31.1	14.3	97.1	9.8	9.8
<b>Miami, FL</b>	44.4	26.9	96.7	21.6	21.6
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	36.2	15.0	97.9	10.1	10.1
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	38.1	15.7	97.7	11.0	11.0
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	26.4	12.2	95.8	9.3	9.3
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	35.2	17.1	97.1	13.1	13.1
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	30.5	13.1	95.5	9.3	9.3
<b>Washington, DC</b>	30.8	9.3	98.6	4.2	4.2
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	40.4	21.5	97.2	15.8	15.8

**Table 7.12 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>%AW in 65% AW Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	24.6	14.1	85.9	12.4	12.4
<b>Denver, CO</b>	33.5	16.0	95.7	11.5	11.5
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	23.1	3.9	99.6	0.3	0.3
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	25.2	8.0	98.5	3.7	3.7
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	46.0	13.4	99.0	4.7	4.7
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	33.2	8.1	99.2	2.7	2.7
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	35.9	18.2	96.0	13.5	13.5
<b>Portland, OR</b>	31.5	14.2	95.9	10.1	10.1
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	34.7	13.8	98.1	8.5	8.5
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	34.6	11.9	98.1	5.8	5.8
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	34.3	12.4	97.7	6.3	6.3
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	33.7	6.4	99.5	1.2	1.2
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	35.9	6.5	99.7	1.1	1.1
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	37.9	8.9	99.3	2.4	2.4
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	30.3	9.6	98.2	4.5	4.5
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	26.4	12.4	93.1	8.7	8.7
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	32.6	10.6	98.2	4.2	4.2

In the detailed city comparison in Table 7.12, the scores for V' are much higher than the scores are in the previous comparison with AW and whites. Double digits are common in this comparison where as for the other AW comparison; there was only one city in doubledigits. There is much more variation across cities in this comparison than in the previous comparison. For example, in Detroit, 97 percent of Asians live in 65 percent Asian areas, and half of AW live in a neighborhood that is 65 percent AW. This may be one of the most extreme cases however on the opposite end, in San Jose, 99 percent of Asians live in 65 percent Asian areas while only one percent of AW live in 65 percent AW neighborhoods. Thus in Detroit, AW experience greater residential polarization than any other city while in San Jose, they experience no polarization.

On average, AW live closer to whites than to Asians. They experience virtually no residential polarization in the white-AW comparison. However, trends in the Asian-AW comparison track those of white-Asian segregation. AW have more variation in the Asian-AW comparison suggesting that AW have the most frequent and consistent contact with whites.

### **Black-Asian Multiracial (BA) Segregation**

#### *Black-Asian Segregation*

Of the 49 cities in this analysis in Table 7.14, on average, segregation is slightly higher in this comparison than for the Black-white comparison. This finding is in some parts surprising as the Black-white comparison is used often as the example of hyper-segregation. However, as stated in earlier chapters, various comparisons in the residential segregation literature have been neglected and the Asian-Black comparison is

one of them. Regionally, Table 7.13 shows the patterns for  $V'$  are nearly the same as the Black-white comparison but is higher in the West. This is the same for the polarization index. Thus, among this group of cities, Black-Asian relations are just as polarized, if not more, than Black-white relations.

Transitioning to the detailed city scores, Nassau, New York and Newark have the highest score on  $V'$  while San Jose and Santa Ana have the lowest score on  $V'$ . When examining the variation across cities we see that Black–Asian segregation is uneven and polarized. Recall, uneven distribution can occur with or without segregation. Yet in the case of Black-Asian segregation, it has both high levels of uneven distribution and polarization. There are some cities where polarization is lower such as Fort Lauderdale, Jacksonville, and Virginia Beach yet these are mostly cities with larger military bases. Military bases are known for their low levels of segregation. However, in most cases, polarization is greater in this comparison.



**Table 7.13 Black-Asian Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	60.74	12.05	34.01	44.97	58.40	78.98
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	42.51	13.13	33.06	27.31	42.76	60.37
% Black in 65% Black Areas	49	72.98	24.62	62.81	32.52	84.12	95.34
% Asian in 65% Asian Areas	49	56.17	22.66	64.94	21.94	55.39	86.88
Polarization Index	49	44.89	17.91	49.06	19.97	46.70	69.03
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	57.94	9.51	24.56	44.83	59.21	69.38
Central	7	55.12	8.92	30.62	40.27	54.71	70.89
South	18	39.71	7.79	22.74	28.00	41.06	50.74
West	17	33.93	11.18	30.17	16.30	31.02	46.46
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	64.23	12.98	37.87	42.94	66.00	80.81
Central	7	56.21	9.73	30.15	45.90	55.39	76.05
South	18	36.06	14.51	41.75	13.70	35.92	55.45
West	17	41.62	17.91	53.67	5.59	45.83	59.27

**Table 7.14 Detailed City Analysis of Black-Asian Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black Areas</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>NORTH</b>					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	71.0	59.2	82.5	72.7	72.7
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	63.2	44.8	88.1	42.9	42.9
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	57.2	46.7	56.6	79.6	79.6
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	73.4	65.5	86.2	73.9	73.9
<b>New York, NY</b>	79.5	69.4	87.7	80.8	80.8
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	79.0	64.7	93.0	66.0	66.0
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	73.6	55.3	90.6	56.7	56.7
<b>CENTRAL</b>					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	82.7	70.9	91.0	76.1	76.1
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	79.2	54.0	95.9	45.9	45.9
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	71.3	54.4	92.7	55.4	55.4
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	84.8	57.3	97.7	50.6	50.6
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	52.9	40.3	68.1	57.6	57.6
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	77.4	54.7	95.4	50.5	50.5
<b>Warren, MI</b>	67.9	53.4	85.4	57.4	57.4
<b>SOUTH</b>					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	68.8	42.9	93.3	36.7	36.7
<b>Austin, TX</b>	60.6	48.9	75.4	63.0	63.0

**Table 7.14 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black Areas</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	67.8	42.3	92.9	35.2	35.5
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	45.9	30.1	62.5	48.6	48.6
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	58.3	31.5	94.0	20.0	20.0
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	67.2	51.1	84.1	54.2	54.2
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	57.4	28.0	94.0	13.5	13.5
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	56.0	39.8	84.8	38.1	38.1
<b>Houston, TX</b>	65.1	48.1	82.6	51.2	51.2
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	60.8	33.4	91.6	20.1	20.1
<b>Miami, FL</b>	74.9	47.8	96.2	37.3	37.3
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	58.0	37.8	85.7	33.1	33.1
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	70.9	42.8	95.3	33.2	33.2
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	50.6	34.3	83.2	33.9	33.9
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	62.0	44.3	87.9	39.9	39.9
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	57.0	27.3	94.8	13.7	13.7
<b>Washington, DC</b>	69.0	50.7	89.0	55.5	55.5
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	59.8	33.7	93.0	21.9	21.9

**Table 7.14 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black Areas</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	39.9	28.9	74.4	35.5	35.3
<b>Denver, CO</b>	57.6	46.5	76.0	59.3	59.3
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	57.6	29.7	26.1	99.2	26.1
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	45.0	30.5	56.1	53.5	53.3
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	70.0	60.4	69.0	86.9	69.0
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	58.4	43.6	51.5	80.8	51.5
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	51.5	41.2	70.2	56.6	56.6
<b>Portland, OR</b>	53.5	43.8	51.1	82.4	51.1
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	49.9	36.9	61.7	58.8	58.8
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	43.8	29.8	37.4	70.7	37.4
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	52.9	36.6	42.1	81.6	42.1
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	55.8	36.0	32.5	95.0	32.5
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	47.1	15.9	4.2	97.9	4.2
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	46.5	16.3	5.6	98.0	5.6
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	48.0	31.0	31.9	82.3	31.9
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	36.8	25.3	49.3	46.7	46.7
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	39.3	24.6	45.8	52.1	45.8

### *Black-BA Segregation*

In Table 7.15 we see that  $V'$  and the polarization index are low. Thus on average, none of the multiracial comparisons in this chapter are in polarized settings. The summary scores indicate that this comparison is slightly less segregated than the Black-BW comparison. However, in the detailed city comparison, the scores for the Black-AW comparison are nearly identical to the Black-BW comparison. This suggests a possibly similarity in the residential experiences of Black-multiracials.

Regionally, segregation is highest in the North and the West in the Black-BA comparison. In the detailed city analysis, there are only three cities in which polarization is in double digits.  $V'$  is significantly lower than  $D'$  in every city. Among the 49 cities as seen in Table 7.16, only 9 cities, Edison, Nassau, New York, Minneapolis, Miami, Honolulu, San Francisco, San Jose, and Santa Ana have scores in double digits. Again, in this comparison, BA are not experiencing residential polarization.

**Table 7.15 Black-BA Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	34.06	7.81	19.94	27.09	32.55	47.03
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	6.96	4.28	22.43	9.37	18.01	31.81
% Black in 65% Black Areas	49	99.82	0.33	0.45	99.53	99.92	99.99
% BA in 65% BA Areas	49	3.45	3.07	5.36	0.95	2.80	6.31
Polarization Index	49	3.45	3.07	5.36	0.95	2.80	6.31
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	9.77	5.40	15.71	3.87	9.78	19.58
Central	7	5.90	3.03	7.47	2.73	4.75	10.20
South	18	4.94	2.85	7.54	2.21	3.82	9.74
West	17	8.37	4.62	13.00	4.07	7.52	17.07
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	4.93	3.64	10.68	1.54	3.72	12.22
Central	7	2.84	1.74	4.16	0.69	3.04	4.85
South	18	2.13	1.62	4.07	0.55	1.61	4.63
West	17	4.50	3.88	10.85	1.02	3.39	11.86

**Table 7.16 Detailed City Analysis of Black-BA Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>% BA in 65% BA Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
NORTH					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	37.7	9.8	100.0	5.7	5.7
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	32.2	5.4	99.9	2.3	2.3
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	42.2	11.2	99.9	6.2	6.2
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	54.4	19.6	99.9	12.2	12.2
<b>New York, NY</b>	54.9	12.6	99.9	3.7	3.7
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	38.8	6.0	100.0	2.8	2.8
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	35.0	3.9	100.0	1.5	1.5
CENTRAL					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	39.5	8.2	100.0	3.8	3.8
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	32.9	3.1	100.0	0.7	0.7
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	24.3	3.8	100.0	1.3	1.3
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	29.3	2.7	100.0	1.3	1.3
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	37.4	10.2	99.9	4.8	4.8
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	30.8	4.8	100.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Warren, MI</b>	36.9	8.6	100.0	4.8	4.8
SOUTH					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	32.3	2.7	100.0	1.0	1.0

**Table 7.16 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>% BA in 65% BA Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Austin, TX</b>	34.0	5.4	99.9	1.9	1.9
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	32.0	3.5	100.0	1.6	1.6
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	27.3	4.0	100.0	1.3	1.3
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	27.6	3.3	100.0	0.9	0.9
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	32.7	4.3	100.0	1.4	1.4
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	41.6	6.0	99.9	2.5	2.5
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	23.3	3.0	100.0	1.6	1.6
<b>Houston, TX</b>	35.6	5.9	100.0	3.1	3.1
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	33.6	3.5	100.0	1.7	1.7
<b>Miami, FL</b>	53.9	11.9	99.9	6.2	6.2
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	47.0	9.7	99.9	4.2	4.2
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	28.3	1.5	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	28.2	3.6	99.9	1.0	1.0
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	37.2	8.3	99.9	4.6	4.6
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	29.2	2.2	100.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Washington, DC</b>	27.8	2.3	100.0	0.6	0.6
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	51.1	7.9	99.9	3.6	3.6



**Table 7.16 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Black in 65% Black areas</b>	<b>% BA in 65% BA Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	31.2	5.3	99.6	2.0	2.0
<b>Denver, CO</b>	31.7	6.3	99.9	3.4	3.4
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	31.2	17.1	98.0	11.9	11.9
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	27.1	4.1	99.9	1.2	1.2
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	34.7	7.9	99.9	4.2	4.2
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	31.2	6.3	99.8	2.9	2.9
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	33.3	8.7	99.8	4.4	4.4
<b>Portland, OR</b>	33.5	8.7	99.7	6.3	6.3
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	34.9	7.5	99.9	3.3	3.3
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	24.4	4.7	99.8	1.7	1.7
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	28.1	6.0	99.7	2.3	2.3
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	28.4	10.0	99.4	5.1	5.1
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	32.6	12.1	99.3	7.2	7.2
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	40.1	21.1	99.2	15.2	15.2
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	28.2	7.7	99.6	3.7	3.7
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	20.6	3.9	99.5	1.0	1.0
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	28.4	5.0	99.8	0.8	0.8

### *Asian-Black Asian*

In this comparison,  $V'$  is low on average, indicating not low polarization. These summary scores in Table 7.17 are nearly identical to the Asian-AW comparison which indicates that Asian multiracials are experiencing similar patterns of contact with Asians. While these summary scores are close, there may be different dynamics working for each group that results in similar contact with Asians. For instance, BA may experience more segregation from Asians because of discrimination while AW experience more segregation from Asians as they have more access to whiteness. These somewhat counter experiences may result in the similar scores on  $V'$ . Regionally,  $V'$  is highest in the Central part of the country and lowest in the West. There is variation in these regional patterns, which are reflected in Table 7.18 in the detailed city list. Like the Asian-AW comparison, the polarization scores for this comparison are some of the highest seen for a multiracial comparison. Again, we can speculate that while AW multiracials are potentially following in an honorary white status, their contact with Asians decreases. But for BA, it may be the rejection from the Asian community that decreases their contact with Asians. This begs the question, what does it mean to have internal stratification for theories like LAT who have a racial middle? If there is internal stratification within the honorary white category, does that mean anything? Is stratification within these categories only a potential issue if the boundaries mean something for whites?

**Table 7.17 Asian-BA Comparison**

<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>50th</b>	<b>90th</b>
<b>Measures of Uneven Distribution</b>							
Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')	49	42.23	10.63	29.75	28.60	40.33	58.35
Unbiased Separation Index (V')	49	14.87	9.85	24.33	4.03	12.32	28.36
% Asian in 65% Asian Areas	49	99.67	0.39	0.69	99.25	99.79	99.94
% BA in 65% BA Areas	49	10.34	8.97	22.24	0.91	7.67	23.15
Polarization Index	49	10.34	8.97	22.24	0.91	7.67	23.15
<b>Regional Variation</b>							
<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>							
North	7	22.73	6.50	19.75	14.39	21.60	34.13
Central	7	23.95	7.85	24.89	11.75	24.65	36.64
South	18	16.58	9.28	23.30	7.70	13.71	31.00
West	17	6.09	3.48	8.95	1.73	5.23	10.68
<b>Polarization Index</b>							
North	7	16.60	6.61	19.47	8.15	16.11	27.62
Central	7	19.21	7.81	25.38	6.04	19.44	31.42
South	18	11.81	8.60	20.74	3.27	8.68	24.01
West	17	2.56	2.27	4.56	0.24	1.83	4.81

**Table 7.18 Detailed City Analysis of Asian-BA Comparison**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>% BA in 65% BA Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
NORTH					
<b>Boston, MA</b>	47.3	23.0	99.8	18.3	18.3
<b>Camden, NJ</b>	46.9	21.6	99.6	15.2	15.2
<b>Edison, NJ</b>	45.9	14.4	99.9	9.9	9.9
<b>Nassau, NY</b>	64.9	34.1	99.7	27.6	27.6
<b>New York, NY</b>	62.6	17.4	99.8	8.1	8.1
<b>Newark, NJ</b>	58.4	27.4	99.7	21.0	21.0
<b>Philadelphia, PA</b>	50.4	21.1	99.8	16.1	16.1
CENTRAL					
<b>Chicago, IL</b>	52.3	21.5	99.9	17.3	17.3
<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	53.7	28.4	99.5	23.1	23.1
<b>Columbus, OH</b>	48.4	18.6	99.7	15.2	15.2
<b>Detroit, MI</b>	64.9	36.6	99.6	31.4	31.4
<b>Minneapolis, MN</b>	38.7	11.7	99.9	6.0	6.0
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>	52.3	26.2	99.7	22.0	22.0
<b>Warren, MI</b>	54.9	24.6	99.8	19.4	19.4
SOUTH					
<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	48.2	17.8	99.7	11.6	11.6
<b>Austin, TX</b>	36.0	7.7	99.9	3.3	3.3

**Table 7.18 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>% BA in 65% BA Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	44.5	15.7	99.7	11.6	11.6
<b>Bethesda, MD</b>	35.6	6.3	99.9	2.7	2.7
<b>Charlotte, NC</b>	42.2	16.6	99.8	13.6	13.6
<b>Dallas, TX</b>	43.6	10.3	99.9	7.3	7.3
<b>Fort Lauderdale, FL</b>	48.6	24.9	98.5	18.8	18.8
<b>Fort Worth, TX</b>	36.0	10.4	99.8	7.0	7.0
<b>Houston, TX</b>	43.6	11.0	99.9	6.2	6.2
<b>Jacksonville, FL</b>	34.1	12.3	99.8	9.0	9.0
<b>Miami, FL</b>	60.5	44.4	98.1	38.7	38.7
<b>Orlando, FL</b>	51.8	20.8	99.5	14.5	14.5
<b>Richmond, VA</b>	40.3	14.7	99.6	8.3	8.3
<b>San Antonio, TX</b>	33.4	10.7	99.5	7.7	7.7
<b>Tampa, FL</b>	43.1	19.3	99.5	14.5	14.5
<b>Virginia Beach, VA</b>	39.2	12.8	99.2	6.6	6.6
<b>Washington, DC</b>	41.6	11.9	99.8	7.2	7.2
<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	56.5	31.0	99.1	24.0	24.0

**Table 7.18 Continued**

<b>City Name</b>	<b>Unbiased Dissimilarity Index (D')</b>	<b>Unbiased Separation Index (V')</b>	<b>% Asian in 65% Asian Areas</b>	<b>% BA in 65% BA Areas</b>	<b>Polarization Index</b>
<b>WEST</b>					
<b>Colorado Springs, CO</b>	31.0	10.7	98.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Denver, CO</b>	37.4	10.2	99.6	3.4	3.4
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>	27.4	1.3	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Las Vegas, NV</b>	30.5	4.6	99.8	1.0	1.0
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>	39.3	8.5	99.9	4.8	4.8
<b>Oakland, CA</b>	36.1	5.8	99.9	2.1	2.1
<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	37.1	14.0	99.6	8.9	8.9
<b>Portland, OR</b>	28.6	6.6	99.9	3.8	3.8
<b>Riverside, CA</b>	39.1	9.7	99.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Sacramento, CA</b>	28.5	4.6	99.9	1.8	1.8
<b>San Diego, CA</b>	34.7	5.2	99.9	1.8	1.8
<b>San Francisco, CA</b>	29.8	2.6	100.0	0.7	0.7
<b>San Jose, CA</b>	31.0	1.7	100.0	0.2	0.2
<b>Santa Ana, CA</b>	37.5	3.1	100.0	0.6	0.6
<b>Seattle, WA</b>	26.5	4.0	99.9	0.9	0.9
<b>Tacoma, WA</b>	23.3	5.9	99.4	3.0	3.0
<b>Vallejo, CA</b>	30.8	4.9	99.8	1.1	1.1

Overall, the Black-Asian comparison has the highest segregation out of any of the comparisons in this analysis. BA experience lowers levels of polarization with Blacks than with Asians in the pairwise comparisons. BA range in their experiences with polarization but on average these scores are low. Lastly we have seen a remarkable increase in our understanding of the processes that maintain racially segregated neighborhoods in the United States. Much of this research utilizes measures of evenness when investigating the residential patterns of the group in question. Measures of uneven distribution have traditionally defaulted to the use of the index of dissimilarity. However, as argued throughout this chapter, this index is not the ideal index for all situations. Primarily when investigating smaller populations and smaller spatial units, the index of dissimilarity is highly volatile. In addition, measures of uneven distribution have a tendency of upward bias. Correcting for this bias with a differences of means calculation, I make use of the unbiased separation index as an alternative to the use of the index of dissimilarity. The separation index is a widely used measure of uneven distribution that is less sensitive to smaller cases which makes it ideal for this line of investigation. In addition, the separation index signals residential polarization offering a more substantive interpretation of segregation. With these benefits, a detailed analysis of three multiracial groups and their parent groups were conducted in a pair-wise comparison to understand residential segregation among multiracial groups.

The findings show that on average, none of the multiracial groups in this study experienced residential polarization. However within each comparison, there was variability in the comparisons. Regional distributions further support this claim while the

list of 49 cities offer detailed analysis for each of these comparisons. Segregation varied across city context and by region. Of the three multiracial groups, AW experience virtually no residential polarization from whites. Moreover on average, BA and BW experienced low levels of segregation from their parent groups but these patterns varied by city and region. In addition, these comparisons revealed patterns for neglected comparisons in traditional investigations of residential segregation. In this 49 city sample, Black-Asian segregation was higher than for Black-white segregation.

Using these findings, the final chapter offers a detailed discussion of the implications of these residential patterns on theories of residential segregation and social position of racial groups in the U.S. racial hierarchy.



CHAPTER VIII  
CONCLUSION: MULTIRACIALS, SEGREGATION  
AND A NEW THEORETICAL FRONTIER

The previous chapters offer a rigorous examination of the residential patterns of three multiracial groups. The findings from these chapters reveal segregation patterns that were largely unknown prior to this investigation. This line of investigation offers compelling evidence for a methodological alternative to conventional measures of segregation. Advances made to traditional measures of segregation make possible the investigation of patterns among groups that were previously underserved in the literature. Moreover, this study is largely an empirical analysis but with a theoretical background to see how social boundaries experienced by larger, single race groups, applies to the multiracial population. Aside from revealing patterns of segregation that were unknown in this much detail, I attempted to find out if the experience of multiracials offers some insight into the changing nature of race and race relations in the U.S.

The racial landscape of the U.S. is rapidly changing based on a variety of social and demographic factors. Projections as to the inclusion of emerging groups into the U.S. racial order revolve around the fate of the U.S. color-line. One way to capture these shifts in the social position of groups in the racial hierarchy is through an assessment of proxies for social position. One such proxy is used in this study—residential segregation.

However, the social position of multiracial individuals remains highly contested in the literature. Thus the purpose of this study is two fold: First, to reveal new patterns in residential segregation of an underserved population in the literature. Research on the multiracial population is only beginning to expand its inquiry to the broader issues that focus on differential life outcomes and life chances of racial groups in the United States. Second, to use these residential outcomes of the multiracial population as an untapped resource to assess the utility of various theoretical claims regarding the social position and residential outcomes of groups.

In what is to follow, I revisit the justification for the use of multiracials in this line of investigation, offer an overview of the empirical findings from the previous chapters and the implications these findings have on the theoretical claims made in the early part of this volume. Lastly, I offer a discussion about the limitations of this study, their implications and future directions of research.

### **Multiracials: The New Frontier**

The multiracial population has always been a part of this nation's racial landscape. Moreover, mixed-race persons have always been a "concern" in American society because of the challenge they pose to the existing racial order. Previous classification schemes have attempted to divide and conquer diversity and difference in the social structure while preserving white privileges. Meanwhile, historically, mixed-race individuals have navigated the racial system in a variety of different ways with varying degrees of systematic challenges and compliance. However, many scholars contest that the significance of "mixed-race" has not been adequately examined within

the sociological literature on social position and racial hierarchy (Romo 2011; Brunisma 2005).

Research on race and ethnicity has concentrated on the Black-white color-line with lesser attention paid to other racial/ethnic formations. However, this trend is changing due in part to the inclusion of the “check all that apply” question to the 2000 Census. This has changed the visibility of the multiracial population in the social and academic arenas.

Furthermore, because this group, in part, represents the outcome of intimate racial interaction, its size, stability and well-being also forecast America’s racial future (Hirschman et al 2000). For this reason, it is advantageous to continue to expand the research on this group. Limited but growing research on the multiracial population is emerging beyond identity formation studies and the study of children/adolescents. Beyond studying this group’s position in larger studies of inequality, assessing the dynamics of multiracial adults provides the opportunity to examine a population that has always been present but is only now captured in our data.

For this reason, I have selected to examine the residential patterns of multiracial groups in order to understand how multiracials fare in existing patterns of inequality and social location. Furthermore, the study of adults aids in advancing multiracial research, as we know little about multiracials when they are adults. Mixed-race persons have a claim to a multiplicity of identities that have implications residential outcomes and overall group position in the racial hierarchy. They present a fairly untapped resource for such lines of investigation.

What was ultimately found is that each multiracial group experienced segregation differently from each other and from their parent group. These findings suggest that the multiracial population is not a monolith and neither is the U.S. racial order. The implications of these finding are discussed in the following sections.

### **Living Life in the Middle: Residential Segregation Beyond Black and White**

Research of racial residential segregation makes it abundantly clear that where groups live has profound consequences for their economic well-being and overall quality of life, since it determines proximity to good job opportunities, safety from crime, and the quality of social networks and educational opportunities (Wilson 1987; Jargowsky 1996; Charles 2006). Segregation is also of importance not only as a causal variable that affects life chances but as a dependent variable that reflects the general position of the group and hence serves as an indicator of the standing of mixed-race persons relative to larger pan-ethnic groups. For these reasons, multiracial segregation patterns were investigated from three different approaches: *sociodemographic comparison*, *contact patterns*, and *measures of uneven distribution*. Three chapters of empirical analysis are presented in this volume revealing three key findings.

*Finding #1: Multiracial residential outcomes vary when compared to those of their parent group.*

Using measures of contact and uneven distribution, the data show BW have more contact with whites than Blacks have with whites. But they also have more contact with Blacks than whites in the average city. Additionally BW experience nearly identical contact patterns as Blacks when it comes to contact with Asians and Latino/as. Thus

their contact with non-white groups is distinct from white contact with non-white groups. Thus while BW have more contact with whites than with Blacks, they “look” more like Blacks when it comes to their contact with non-white groups. In comparison to segregation between Blacks and whites, white-BW segregation is significantly lower with virtually no polarization. BW also experience greater polarization from Blacks than they do from whites; however, these scores are in no way close to replicating the polarization between Blacks and whites.

On the opposite end, AW “look” the most like whites in their contact patterns. AW have more contact with whites than Asian contact with whites. BA on the other hand experience the most variation in their contact with other groups than the both Blacks and Asians. BA experience lower levels of polarization with Blacks than is experienced in the Black-Asian pairwise comparison. BA range in their experiences with polarization but on average these scores are lower than for the Black-Asian comparison. BA also experience greater neighborhood diversity than their parent groups.

*Finding #2: Multiracial residential outcomes vary across type of multiracial combination.*

As stated previously, BA consistently experience greater contact with non-white populations and, on average, experience the greatest amount of neighborhood diversity. BA have the least amount of contact with whites in the average city. In contrast, AW experience the least amount of diversity in the average city out of the three multiracial groups. AW consistently live closest to whites out of any multiracial group, in almost every city in the 49 city analysis. BW, on the other hand, maintains an intermediate

position between multiracial groups and between their single race counterparts. At times BW residential patterns are closer to AW and at other times it is closer to BA. These patterns are often dependent upon the size of the Black and white population in the city. Therefore, while BW hold an intermediary space, that “between space” is relative.

*Finding #3: Residential outcomes for multiracials varies across urban areas and regions of the country.*

As stated in Chapter 6, two clear patterns emerge regarding place variation: 1) overall residential patterns hold up across cities reflecting general patterns of race relations; however 2) the way these patterns play out in cities of a particular type are more or less pronounced. The residential patterns of multiracials and monoracial groups vary based on the social and demographic context of the city. The residential patterns outlined in the empirical chapters feature variation in established and expected residential contact and polarization for monoracial groups and fairly consistent residential patterns for multiracial groups. This variation suggests that the U.S. racial structure is not a monolith. Instead it is simultaneously rigid in its overarching patterns but fluid in the ways they play out across contexts.

### **Different Manifestations of the Racial Hierarchy? A Theoretical Approach**

One of the main contributions of this project is the vast amount of descriptive data unveiled where there is no precedent. From here, a myriad of both qualitative and quantitative investigation can be pursued regarding various components of the multiracial experience in the housing market. A secondary component is to understand these patterns against the larger backdrop of the changing nature of race relations in the

U.S. Recall the six different theoretical perspectives described in earlier chapters: *Binary (White/Non-White, Black/Non-Black)*, *Latin-Americanization Thesis*, *Spatial Assimilation*, *Place Stratification*, and *Eclectic Group Differences*. Here, I revisit their claims in relation to each multiracial group in the study. What is most apparent in the findings is that there is variation within the segregation patterns of multiracial groups and across spatial contexts. Therefore, some theories are more advantageous than others in providing support for these findings.

*Asian-White Multiracials: Spatial Assimilation or Honorary Whites?*

AW stood out throughout the analysis as the one multiracial group with the highest contact with whites and lowest levels of segregation from whites. Additionally, they had the highest levels of educational attainment and household income than any other multiracial group. Thus, the spatial assimilation model is ideal in describing the residential patterns of this multiracial group. Through economic, social and educational gains, AW have reached a level of contact with the dominant group that is nearly identical to the dominant groups' contact with themselves.

Due to their consistent contact with whites, the AW group may have in fact surpassed the “honorary white” category as they are not a buffer for other groups in the “honorary white” category. Their contact with whites is far higher than even Asian contact with whites. And in educational attainment, AW have surpassed whites. Due to their part-white identity, AW may have far greater access to whiteness than other groups in the honorary white category. Gallagher (2003) states that the white multiracial population is going through what he terms a “racial redistricting” in which the

boundaries of whiteness expand to include groups that historically would have been defined as minorities. This concept is able to describe what was experienced by AW but not by BW. Thus the conception that all white multiracials are the same, is not the most advantageous categorization. However, in the same vein, the binary perspective, *White-non/White* addresses the patterns of AW in a limited capacity.

#### *Black-White Multiracials: The True Racial Middle?*

In comparison to the other multiracial groups, BW are often in the middle in sociodemographic characteristics, contact patterns and segregation scores in relation to other multiracial groups. In addition, BW have higher levels of contact with Asians and Latino/as than the other multiracial groups. Thus BW have the greatest contact with those groups who have been conceived as the new racial middle (O'Brien 2008). Thus, it may be best to conceive of BW as in fact, *honorary whites* as outlined in the LAT. They experience lower to moderate levels of segregation from other single-race groups. Additionally, they do not experience residential polarization from their parent groups. But their patterns fall in-between the patterns of the Black-white pairwise comparison. Thus BW truly are a middle group with close proximity to the larger “buffer” groups (Asians and Latino/as).

#### *Black-Asians: The New Diversity?*

The BA group had the least amount of contact with the white population, the most contact with the black population, and experienced the most diversity at the neighborhood level than any other multiracial group. They also experienced the most variation in the three different measures of contact presented in Chapter 6. In the



pairwise comparisons, BA experience lowers levels of polarization from Blacks than from Asians. BA range in their experiences with polarization but on average these scores are low. Lastly, the segregation patterns of BA at times track BW and AW depending upon the pairwise comparison.

Overall, BA experienced the most variation in their residential patterns, at times tracking the patterns of Blacks and at other times living closer to other non-white groups. The majority of the perspectives are not equipped to deal with this much variation in residential patterns. The place stratification model may be useful in understanding this variation as a potential result of discrimination in the housing market unaccounted for by their part-white counterparts. Dual minority status may result in greater experiences with discrimination than a majority-minority identity for mixed-race persons. Consequently, multiracials' experiences with discrimination are vastly understudied. This would be a line of investigation for future research.

In addition, the *Black/Non-Black* perspective is too rigid as in many cities; BA had substantial contact with non-Black groups and lower contact with Blacks. The *Eclectic Group Differences* perspective is the only perspective that has a mechanism to account for variation of any kind. This perspective also projects that group size may result in lower levels of segregation for multiracial groups. As stated earlier, BA are the smallest multiracial group in the study. This may result in less restriction in the housing market resulting in the variation in residential patterns of this group. Whether it is discrimination, group size, a combination of both or something different, BA are living in the most diverse spaces than any other multiracial groups which may signal a

connection between dual minority status and the preference for diverse residential settings.

### **Variation: Theoretical Limitations**

A consistent theme throughout this volume is the variability in the patterns established. Multiracials vary in their experiences based on their racial composition. They vary in their patterns from their single-race counterparts and their patterns vary across city context. Only one perspective addresses this potential for variation in these patterns. The Eclectic Group Differences perspective states that context in which a group is situated is just as influential as their demographic characteristics.

However, the variation across cities brings to bare weaknesses in various theoretical frames that capture the dynamic process of inequality, hierarchy, and spatial difference. These differences reflect an aspect of fluidity in race relations that is under theorized in the literature. A possible trigger to this variation is something to do with ethnic demography and social history. For example, Detroit and Chicago have certain histories with the Great Migration while Portland does not share that history. Portland has a different set of histories that influence the residential context of the city resulting in Blacks living closer to whites on average—more so than in Detroit. Does this mean that if a minority population moved to Portland in mass Portland would turn into Detroit or Chicago? Or does this mean that Portland is the new face of race in the U.S.? Will Chicago move in the direction of Portland? These perspectives laid out here offer no real guide to answer these questions. Furthermore, processes such as the chances for interaction and affiliation with out-group members also increases when there are diverse

populations present in the metro area. If this is the case, will we see BA multiracials concentrated in diverse cities and AW in whiter cities? Is there a connection between diversity and residential desirability? And is that the same for all groups at all times?

The residential patterns outlined in this chapter are on a sliding scale, reflecting that the U.S. racial structure is not a monolith. There is both fluidity and rigidity to the residential patterns investigated in this study. While the social position of multiracial groups may remain contested, what is clear is that our conceptualization of the racial hierarchy and the theories that support it would benefit from the inclusion of a mechanism to discuss the variation of these patterns across spatial units.

### **Limitations: Latino/a Multiracials**

One of the glaring limitations of this study is the absence of the Latino/a multiracial population. As stated in the methods chapter, due to the way in which the Census asks the race question, it did not permit me to include Latino/a multiracials in this study. Despite their absence here, I will discuss the implications of Latino/a multiracials in the study of the multiracial population.

According to the *2010 Census Brief*, between 2000 and 2010 the Hispanic population grew by 43 percent—rising from 35.3 million in 2000, when this group made up 13 percent of the total population. Their population increase accounts for over half of the 27.3 million increase in the total population of the U.S. This growth is primarily a result of the growth in immigration amongst this population. Consequently, the growth in the Latino/a populations has increased implications for race relations, intermarriage and the multiracial population.

Today's immigration dramatizes the analytical inadequacy of the Black-white color line. Furthermore, the increase in immigration impacts other social trends that continue to enhance the racial/ethnic diversity of the U.S.—most notably the rise in intermarriage and the growth of the multiracial population. Unlike the immigrants who arrived at the turn of the twentieth century, today's immigrants are notable because a large share is from Latin America.

Intermarriage between whites and Latino/as have increased substantially. Ten years ago, over 30 percent of Latino/a marriages were interracial (Bean and Stevens 2003). Now, Latino/a intermarriage makes up over 10 percent of the total interracial marriages in the nation (Census Brief 2010). The intermarriage rates for Asian and Latino/as are nearly three times as high as that of Blacks and more than five times the rate of whites. Furthermore, the young, native-born Latino/a populations are the most likely to intermarry within the total Latino/a population and their partners are most often white. The rise in the intermarriage rates of this population has in turn led to a sizable and growing multiracial population.

Furthermore, the geographic concentration on the Latino/a population has implications for the multiracial population. Like the multiracial population, Latino/as are concentrated in the West and South. More than three quarters of the Latino/a population lives in the West or in the South. States with higher percentages of couples of a different race or Hispanic origin were primarily located in the West and Southwestern parts of the country. These areas obviously tend to have high Latino/a population. Thus in places

where the multiracial population are concentrated, there are also the highest rates of interracial coupling, much of which is amongst the Latino/a population.

These trends tell us that Latino/a multiracials can offer a wealth of knowledge regarding various aspects of the racial order and the fate of the U.S. color-line. Given that a prominent share of Latin/a intermarriage is with a white partner, Latino/a multiracials offer insight to the fluidity and flexibility of racial and ethnic boundaries. Is whiteness expanding to accommodate these groups? Is racial/ethnic prejudice and discrimination less salient for these groups?

In future research, I plan to use the 2012 General Social Survey which treats Latino/as as a racial group thus I will be able to include this population for an investigation on the housing attitudes and experiences multiracial adults.

### **Into the Future**

As stated throughout this chapter, there are many options for the future directions of this study. Namely, I am interested in pursuing the experiences of multiracials in the housing market both quantitatively and qualitatively. I am interested in their experiences with discrimination in the housing market, their housing attitudes, preferences, migration patterns and reasons behind their neighborhood selection. More broadly, I will continue my investigation of adult multiracials to generate a greater understanding of their experience within the life-cycle such as marriage rates (who they marry, when they marry), fertility and childbirth (how many children they have, how they racially identify their children), and experiences in the labor market.

The goal of this investigation was to provide insight into relatively new residential patterns of the multiracial population—a population of growing concern and visibility in the U.S. racial landscape. In addition, I placed one foot into the hotly debated questions concerning which theoretical models best predict the racial and ethnic incorporation or exclusion of mixed-race groups in the U.S. (Lee and Bean 2007; Gallego 2007). I note that the conception of these debates generally surrounds white multiracial groups which undermines the diversity within the multiracial population. To this end, I offered the comparison of a dual-minority status multiracial group. I found that the diversity within the multiracial population results in variation in experience with segregation and overall group contact. Furthermore, I found the residential experiences of each group varied over demographic contexts offering interesting insight to established patterns within the literature on residential segregation.

The variation presented throughout this study also reveals dynamic processes entrenched within our rigid racial structure. The multiracial experience it complicates the idea of a white/non-white or Black/non-Black experience when you have groups that are neither white nor Black. Because these groups occupy a multiplicity of racial identities they serve as a bellwether of how the racial order is at times both rigid and fluid. However this feature of the multiracial community is only valuable if we have theoretical frames that can account for this potential fluidity in our notions of racial boundaries as well as identification.

## REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, Janet L. 2007. *Race, Space, and Riots in Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aguirre, B.E., Saenz, Rogelio and Sean-Shong, Hwang. 1990. "Discrimination and the Assimilation and Ethnic Competition Perspectives." *Social Science Quarterly* 70:594–606.
- Alba, R.D., J.R. Logan. 1993. "Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual Level Analysis of Segregation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6):1388-427.
- Alba, R.D. 1999. "Immigration and the American Realities of Assimilation and Multiculturalism." *Sociological Forum* 14(1):3-25.
- Alba, R.D., Logan, J.R. and Stults, B.J. 2000. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis." *Social Forces* 79(2):587– 621.
- Alba, R.D. and Nee, V. 2003. *Remaking the American Manistream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Andrews, George Reid. 2004. *Afro-Latin America, 1800-2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bashi, Vilna and Antonio McDaniel. 1997. "A Theory of Immigration and Racial Stratification." *Journal of Black Studies* 27(5):668-82.
- Bean, Frank D., Berg, Ruth R. and Van Hook, Jennifer V.W. 1996. "Socioeconomic and Cultural Incorporation and Marital Disruption among Mexican Americans." *Social Forces* 75(2):593-617.
- Beltran, Mary, and Fojas, Camilla. 2008. *Mixed Race Hollywood*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Bennett, Pamela. 2011. "The Social Position of Multiracial Groups in the United States: Evidence from Residential Segregation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(4).
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. 1967. *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Blau, Peter. 1977. "A Macrosociological Theory of Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(1).

- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 62:465-480.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2004. "From Bi-racial to Tri-racial: Towards a New System of Racial Stratification in the USA." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27: 931-950.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. *Racism without Racists: Color Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*, Second Edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Embrick, David G. 2006. "The (White) Color of Color Blindness in Twenty-First-Century Amerika." Pp. 3-24 in *Race, Ethnicity, and Education: Racism and Antiracism in Education*, edited by E. Wayne Ross and Valerie Ooka Pang. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bratter, J. L. 2007. "Will Multiracial Survive to the Next Generation? The Racial Classification of Children of Multiracial Parents." *Social Forces* 86(2):821-849.
- Bratter, J. L., and Eschbach, K. 2006. "What About the Couple?" Interracial Marriage and Psychological Distress. *Social Science Research* 35(4):1025–1047.
- Bratter, J. L., & Gorman, B. K. 2011. "Does Multiracial Matter? A Study of Racial Disparities in Self-Rated Health." *Demography* 48(1): 127–52.
- Brunisma, D. L. 2006a. "Public Categories, Private Identities: Exploring Regional Differences in the Biracial Experience." *Social Science Research* 35:555-576.
- Brunisma, D. L. 2006b. "Mixed messages: Doing Race in the Color-blind Era." Pp. 1-10 In *Mixed Messages: Multiracial Identities in the "Color-blind" Era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner. □
- Brunisma, D.L., & Rockquemore K.A. 2001. "The New Color Complex: Appearances and Biracial Identity." *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 1(3):225-246.
- Butters, Robert D. 1993. "The Real Estate Industry's View of Audit Results: Comments." Pp. 153-164 in *Clear and Convincing Evidence: Measurement of Discrimination in America*. edited by, Fix, Michael and Raymond J. Struyk. Washington, D.C.: Urban Instituted Press.
- Campbell, Mary. 2010. "Social Class and Multiracial Groups: What Can We Learn from Large Surveys?" Pp. 165-183 in *Multiracial Americans and Social Class: The Influence of Social Class on Racial Identity*, edited by Kathleen Odell Korgen. New York: Routledge.



- Campbell, Mary E., and Herman, M.R. 2010. "Politics and Policies: Attitudes Toward Multiracial Americans." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33(9):1511–1536.
- Campbell, Mary E. and Jennifer Eggerling-Boeck. 2006. "What About the Children? The Psychological and Social Well-Being of Multiracial Adolescents." *The Sociological Quarterly* 47(1):147-73.
- Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. 2000. "Neighborhood Racial-Composition Preferences: Evidence from a Multiethnic Metropolis." *Social Problems* 47(3):379–407.
- Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. 2003. "The Dynamics of Residential Segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:167-207.
- Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. 2006. *Won't You Be My Neighbor? Race, Class and Residence in Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Child, Erica Chito. 2009. *Fade to Black and White*. Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Clark, William. A.V. 1986. "Residential Segregation in American Cities: A Review and Interpretation." *Population Research Policy Review* 5:95–127.
- Clark, William. A.V. 1988. "Understanding Residential Segregation in American Cities: Interpreting the Evidence, A Reply to Galster." *Population Research Policy Review* 8:193–97.
- Clark, William. A. V. 1992. "Residential Preferences and Residential Choices in A Multi-Ethnic Context." *Demography* 29:451-466.
- Clark, William. A. V. 2009. "Preferences Across Income ,Education, and Age Findings from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality." *Urban Affairs Review* 334–355.
- Clarkwest, Andrew. 2006. "Premarital Characteristics, Selection into Marriage, and African American Marital Disruption." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 37:361-80.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle.W. 1988. "Race, Reform, Retrenchment: Transformation and Legitimation in Anti-Discrimination Law." *Harvard Law Review* 101:1331 1387.
- DaCosta, Kimberly. 2007. *Making Multiracials: State, Family and Market in the Redrawing of the Color Line*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Dalmage, Heather M. 2000. *Tripping on the Color Line: Black-White Multiracial Families in a Racially Divided World*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Daniel, G. Reginald. 1992. "Beyond Black and White: The New Multiracial Consciousness." Pp. 333-341 in *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by M. P. P. Root. Newbury, CA: Sage Publications.
- Daniel, G. Reginald. 2002. *More Than Black? : Multiracial Identity and the New Racial Order*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Daniel, G. Reginald and Josef Manuel Castaneda-Liles. 2006. "Race, Multiraciality, and the Neoconservative Agenda." Pp. 127-48 in *Mixed Messages: Multiracial Identities in the "Color-Blind" Era*, edited by D. L. Brunsma. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Darity Jr., William. 2005. "Stratification Economics: The Role of Intergroup Inequality." *Journal of Economics and Finance* 29(2):144-153.
- Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women, Race, and Class*. New York: Random House.
- Davis, J. F. 2002. *Who is Black? One Nation's Definition*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press. □
- Davis, J. F. 2006. "Defining Race: Comparative Perspectives." Pp. 15-31 in *Mixed Messages: Multiracial Identities in the "Color-blind" Era*, edited by in D. L. Brunsma. Boulder, CO: Lynn Rienner.
- Doyle, Jamie M. and Grace Kao. 2007. "Are Racial Identities of Multiracials Stable? Changing Self-Identification Among Single and Multiple Race Individuals." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70:405-423.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1899. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. University Park: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1990 (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. (1909). "The Souls of White Folks." Pp. 55-74 in *Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil*. New York: Humanity Books.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Beverly Duncan. 1955. "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indices." *American Sociological Review* 20:210-217.
- Duncan & Duncan. 2003. *Landscapes of Privilege: The Politics of the Aesthetics in an American Suburb*. New York: Routeledge.

- Ellen, I.G. 2000. *Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Prospects for Stable Racial Integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Ellis, Mark, Holloway, Steven R., Wright, Richard and Fowler, Christopher. 2012 "Agents of Change: Mixed-Race Households and the Dynamics of Neighborhood Segregation in the United States." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102(3):549-570.
- Feagin, J. R. 2000. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Farley, R. 1996. "Racial Differences in the Search for Housing: Do Whites and Blacks Use the Same Techniques to Find Housing?" *Housing Policy Debate* 7:367-86.
- Farley, R., Fielding, E.L., Krysan, M. 1997. "The Residential Preferences of Whites and Blacks: A Four-Metropolis Analysis." *Housing Policy Debate* 8(4):763–800.
- Farley, R. 2002. "Racial Identities in 2000: The Response to the Multiple-Race Response Option." Pp. 33-61 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Perlmann, Joel and Waters, Mary C. New York: Russell Sage.
- Farrell, C. and Lee, F. 2011. "Racial Diversity and Change in Metropolitan Neighborhoods." *Social Sciences Research* 40:1108-1123.
- Ferguson, Susan J. 1995. "Marriage Timing of Chinese American and Japanese American Women." *Journal of Family Issues* 16(3):314-43.
- Fernandez, Ronald. 2007. *Beyond Black and White: How Immigrants and Fusions Are Helping Us Overcome the Racial Divide*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Forman, Tyrone A., Goar, Carla, Lewis, Amanda. 2002. "Neither Black nor White? An Empirical Test of the Latin Americanization Thesis." *Race and Society*(5) 65 84.
- Fossett, Mark. 2008. "Casting Segregation as Group Differences on Residential Outcomes: A New Conceptualization of Aggregate Indices of Residential Segregation." Presented at the *Annual Meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association* in Las Vegas, NV.
- Fossett, Mark, and C. Cready. 1998. "Ecological approaches to the study of racial and ethnic differentiation and inequality." Pp. 157-194 in *Continuities in Sociological Human Ecology*, edited by M. Micklin and D. L. Poston, Jr. New York: Plenum.

- Fossett, Mark and Wenquan Zhang. 2011. "Unbiased Indices of Uneven Distribution and Exposure: New Alternatives for Segregation Research." Presented at the *Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America* in Washington, D.C.
- Fu, X and Hartfiled, M. 2000. "Intermarriage and Segmented Assimilation: U.S. Born Asians in 2000." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 11(3):249-277.
- Gallagher, Charles. 2007. "New Directions in Race Research." *Social Forces* 86(2):553-559.
- Gans, Herbert. 1999. *The Possibility of a New Racial Hierarchy in the Twenty-First Century United States*. University of Chicago Press.
- Glaeser, E. L. and Vigdor, J. L. 2001. *Racial Segregation in the 2000 Census: Promising News*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life*. Oxford University Press.
- Gould, Stephen. 1996. *The Mismeasurement of Man*. New York: Norton & Company.
- Grazian, D. 2004. *Blue Chicago: The Search for Authenticity in Urban Blues Clubs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grief, Meredith. 2009. "Neighborhood Attachment in the Multiethnic Metropolis." *City and Community* 8(1):27-45.
- Guevarra, R. P., Jr. 2003. "Burritos and Bagoong: Mexipinos and Multiethnic Identity in San Diego, California." Pp. 72-96 *Crossing Lines: Race and Mixed Race Across the Geohistorical Divide*, edited by M. Coronado, R. P. Guevarra, Jr., J. Moniz, & L. F. Szanto. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara, Multiethnic Student Outreach.
- Hall, Christine C. Iijima. 1980. *The Ethnic Identity of Racially Mixed People: A Study of Black Japanese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hall, Christine C. Iijima and Trude Cooke 2001. "Diversity of Biracial Individuals: Asian-White and Asian-Minority Biracial Identity." Pp. 81-92 in *The Sum of Our Parts: Mixed-Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Turner Williams-Leon, Teresa and Nakashima, Cynthia. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hao, Lingxin and Eric Fong. 2010. "Linking Dichotomous Segregation with Multi-group Segregation: Weighted Segregation Ratios in Selected US Metro Areas." *Social Sciences Research* 40:379-391.
- Harris, Cheryl I. 1993. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106:1707-1791.

- Harris, David R. and Sims, Jeremiah Joseph. 2002. "Who is Mixed Race? Assessing the Complexity of Lived Race." *American Sociological Review* 67(4):614-27.
- Harris, David R. 2001. "Why are Whites and Blacks Averse to Black Neighbors?" *Social Science Research* 30(1):100–16.
- Harris, David R. 2002. "Does it Matter How We Measure? Racial Classification and the Characteristics of Multiracial Youth." Pp. 62-101 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Perlmann, Joel and Waters, Mary C. New York: Russell Sage.
- Heckman, James J. and Seigleman, Peter. 1993. "The Urban Institute Audit Studies: Their Methods and Findings." Pp. 147-65 in *Clear and Convincing Evidence: Measurement of Discrimination in America*, edited by, Fix, Michael and Struyk, Raymond J. Washington, D.C.: Urban Instituted Press.
- Herman, M., 2004. "Forced to Choose: Some Determinants of Racial Identification in Multiracial Adolescents." *Child Development* 75:730–748.
- Hirschman, Charles. 2004. "The Origins and Demise of the Concept of Race." *Population and Development Review* 30(3):385-415.
- Hitlin, S, Brown, J, and Elder, G. 2006. "Racial Self Categorization in Adolescence: Multiracial Development and Social Pathways." *Child Development* 77(5):1298-1308.
- Hochschild, Jennifer and Powell, Brenna M. 2008. "Racial Reorganization and the United States Census 1850-1930: Mulattos, Half-Breeds, Mixed Parentage, Hindoos, and the Mexican Race." *Studies in American Political Development* 22:59-96.
- Holloway, Steve, Mark Ellis, Richard Wright and Margaret Hudson. 2005. "Partnering 'Out' and Fitting In: Residential Segregation and the Neighborhood Context of Mixed-Race Households." *Population, Space and Place* 11:299-324.
- Holloway, Steve, Ellis Mark, Wright Richard and East, Margaret. 2009. "Place, Scale and Racial Claims for Multiracial Children in the 1990 U.S. Census." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(3):522-547.
- Hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Second Edition. Cambridge: South End Press.
- Iceland, John. 2004. "Beyond Black and White: Metropolitan Residential Segregation in Multiethnic America." *Social Science Research* 33:248.

- Iceland, John, and Wilkes, Rima. 2006. "Does Socioeconomic Status Matter? Race, Class, and Residential Segregation." *Social Problems* 53:248–273.
- Jackson, J. 2001. *Harlem World: Doing Race and Class in Contemporary Black America*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Jacobson, M.F. 1999. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jacobson, M.F. 2002. "History, Historicity, and the Census Count by Race." Pp. 259-262 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Perlmann, Joe and Waters, Mary C. New York: Russell Sage.
- Jargowsky, P.A. 1996. *Poverty and Place: Ghettos, Barrios, and the American City*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Jiménez, T. R. 2003. "Multiethnic Mexican Americans in demographic and ethnographic perspectives." Pp. 161-188 in *Crossing Lines: Race and Mixed Race Across the Geohistorical Divide*, edited by M. Coronado, R. P. Guevarra, Jr., J. Moniz, & L. F. Szanto. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara, Multiethnic Student Outreach.
- Jiménez, T. R. 2010. *Replenished Ethnicity: Mexican Americans, Immigration, and Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jiobu, Robert, 1988. *Ethnicity and Assimilation: Black, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Koreans, Mexicans, Vietnamese, and Whites*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jiobu, Robert. 1990. *Ethnicity and Inequality*. Albany: State University of New York Press. □
- Jones, N. and Smith, Amy Symens. 2001. "The Two or More Races Population: 2000." *Census 2000 Brief*, Washington, DC: United States Census Bureau.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1993. "Trends in Black/White Intermarriage." *Social Forces* 72 (1):119-46. □
- Khanna, Nikki. 2004. "The Role of Reflected Appraisals in Racial Identity: The Case of Multiracial Asians." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67(2):115–31.
- Khanna, Nikki and Cathryn Johnson. 2010. "Passing as Black: Racial Identity Work Among Biracial Americans." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 73(4):380-397.
- Korgen, K. 2010. *Multiracial Americans and Social Class: The Influence of Social Class on Racial Identity*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Korgen, K., & O'Brien, E. 2006. "Black/white Friendships in a Color-blind Society." Pp. 267-284, in *Mixed Messages: Multiracial Identities in the "Color-blind" Era*, edited by Brunson, D.L. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Krysan, M. 2002. "Whites Who Say They'd Flee: Who are They, and Why Would They Leave?" *Demography* 39(4):675-96.
- Krysan, M. 2008. "Does Race Matter in the Search for Housing? An Exploratory Study of Search Strategies, Experiences, and Locations." *Social Science Research* 37(2):581-603.
- Krysan, M, Farley R. 2002. "The Residential Preferences of Blacks: Do They Explain Persistent Segregation?" *Social Forces* 80:937-80.
- Krysan, M, Mick Couper, Reynolds Farley, Tyrone Forman. 2009. "Does Race Matter in Neighborhood Preferences? Results from a Video Experiment." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(2):527-559.
- Lacy, Karyn R. 2007. *Blue-Chip Black: Race, Class and Status in the New Black Middle Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lee, J., & Bean, F.D. 2004. "America's Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification." *American Review of Sociology* 30:221-42.
- Lee, J., & Bean, F. D. 2007. "Reinventing the Color Line: Immigration and America's New Racial/Ethnic Divide" *American Review of Sociology* 86(2):561-586.
- Leonard, K. I. 1992. *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Liebersohn, S. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Liebler, Carolyn and Andrew Halpern-Manners. 2008. "A Practical Approach to Using Multiple Race Response Data: A Bridge for Public-Use Microdata." *Demography* 45(1):143-155.
- Logan, J.R., Alba R.D. 1993. "Locational Returns to Human Capital: Minority Access to Suburban Community Resources." *Demography* 30(2):243-68.
- Logan, J.R. et al. 2001. "Separating the Children." Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center, [www.s4.brown.edu/cen2000/report.html](http://www.s4.brown.edu/cen2000/report.html).
- López, Ian Haney. 2006. *White By Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. Revised and

Updated 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition. New York: New York University Press.

- Lou, Evelina and Lanlonde, Richard. 2011. Examining a Multidimensional Framework of Racial Identity Across Different Biracial Groups. *Asian American Journal of Psychology* 2(2):79-90.
- Massey, Douglas and Denton, Nancy. 1985. Spatial Assimilation as a Socioeconomic Outcome. *American Sociological Review* 50:94–106.
- Massey, Douglas and Denton, Nancy. 1987. "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians: 1970–1980." *American Sociological Review* 52(6):802-825.
- Massey, Douglas and Denton, Nancy. 1988. "The Dimensions of Residential Segregation." *Social Forces* 67:281-315.
- Massey, Douglas and Denton, Nancy. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Massey, Douglas and Fischer, M.J. 1999. "Does Rising Income Bring Integration? New Results for Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in 1990." *Social Science Research* 28:316–26.
- Massey, Douglas and Lundy, Garvey 1996. "Use of Black English and Racial Discrimination in Urban Housing Markets: New Methods and Findings." *Urban Affairs Review* 36(4):452-469.
- Model, Suzanne. 2008. *West Indies Immigrants: A Black Success Story*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation Publication.
- Myrdal, G. 1944. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Random House.
- Okamoto, D. G. 2007. "Marrying Out: A Boundary Approach to Understanding the Marital Integration of Asian Americans." *Social Science Research* 36(4):1391.
- Oliver, M.L., Shapiro, T.M. 1995. *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Routledge.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. 1994. *Racial Formations in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.
- Park, Jerry Z. 2008. "Second-Generation Asian American Pan-Ethnic Identity: Pluralized Meanings of a Racial Label." *Sociological Perspectives* 51(3):541-61.



- Park, R. E. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* 33:881-893.
- Park, R. E., Burgess, E. W. and McKenzie, R.D. 1925. *The City*. Chicago: University Press.
- Pattillo-McCoy, M. 1999. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril Among the Black Middle Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Perlmann, Joel and Waters, Mary C. 2002. *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Persily, Nathaniel. 2002. "The Legal Implications of a Multiracial Census." Pp. 161-188 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Perlmann, Joel and Waters, Mary C. New York: Russell Sage.
- Phillips, Julie A. and Massey, Douglas. 2000. "Engines of Immigration: Stocks of Human and Social Capital in Mexico." *Social Science Quarterly* 81(1):33-48.
- Powell, John A. 2000. "Whites Will be Whites: The Failure to Interrogate Racial Privilege." *University of San Francisco Law Review* 34: 419-464.
- Qian, Zhenchao and Lichter, Daniel T. 2007. "Social Boundaries and Marital Assimilation: Interpreting Trends in Racial and Ethnic Intermarriage." *American Sociological Review* 72:68-94.
- Qian, Zhenchao, Blair, Sampson Lee, and Ruf, Stacey D. 2001. "Asian America Interracial and Interethnic Marriages: Differences by Education and Nativity." *International Migration Review* 35(2): 551-86.
- Renn, Kristen A. 2000. "Patterns of Situation Identity Among Biracial and Multiracial College Students." *The Review of Higher Education* 23(4):399-420.
- Rockquemore, K. and Brunisma, D. 2008. *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rockquemore, K. and Brunisma, D. 2002. "Socially Embedded Identities: Theories, Typologies, and Processes of Racial Identity among Black/White Biracials." *The Sociological Quarterly* 43(3):335-356.
- Roediger, David. 1991. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. New York: Verso.
- Roediger, David. 2002. "Whiteness and Ethnicity in the History of 'White Ethnics' in the United States." Pp. 325-343 in *Race Critical Theories*, edited by Essed P. and Goldberg, D. T. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

- Romo, R. 2011. "Between Black and Brown: Blaxican (Black-Mexican) Multiracial Identity in California." *Journal of Black Studies* 42(3):402–426.
- Root, M. 1990. "Resolving "Other" Status: Identity Development of Biracial Individuals." *Women and Therapy* 9:185-205.
- Root, M. 1992. *Racially Mixed People in America*. New York: Sage Publications □
- Saenz, Rogelio, Sean-Shong Hwang, and Benigno E. Aguirre. 1994. "In Search of Asian War Brides." *Demography* 31(3):549-59.
- Saenz, Rogelio, Sean-Shong Hwang, and Robert Anderson. 1995. "Persistence and Change in Asian Identity Among Children of Intermarried Couples." *Sociological Perspectives* 38:175–94.
- Saenz, Rogelio, Maria Cristina Morales, and Maria Isabel Ayala. 2004. "United States: Immigration to the Melting Pot of the Americas." Pp. 211-32 in *Migration and Immigration: A Global View*, edited by Toro M.I. Morn and Alicea, M. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Schelling, T. C. 1971. "Dynamic Models of Segregation." *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 1:143–186. □
- Snipp, Matthew 1989. *American Indians: The First of the Land*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Snipp, Matthew. 2002. "American Indians: Clues to the Future of Other Racial Groups." Pp. 189-214 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Perlmann, Joel and Waters, Mary C. New York: Russell Sage.
- Snipp, Matthew. 2003. "Racial Measurement in the American Census." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 563-588.
- Squires, G.D., Kim S. 1995. "Does Anybody Who Works Here Look Like Me?: Mortgage Lending, Race, and Lender Employment." *Social Sciences Quarterly* 76(4):823-38.
- St. John, Craig and Clark, Frieda. 1984. "Race and Social Class Differences in the Characteristics Desired in Residential Neighborhoods." *Social Science Quarterly* 65(3):803-813.
- Sundstrom, Ronald. 2001. "Being and Being Mixed Race." *Social Theory and Practice* 27(2): 285-307.
- Sweeney, Megan M. and PHilips, Julie A. 2004. "Understanding Racial Differences in Marital Disruption: Recent Trends and Explanations." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66(3):639-50.

- Telles, Edward E. and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Thornton, M. C. 1983. *A Social History of Multiethnic Identity: The Case of Black Japanese Americans*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International. □
- Thornton, M.C. 1992. "Is the Multiracial Status Unique? The Personal and Social Experience" Pp. 321-325 in *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by Root, M.P.P. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Thornton, M.C. and Gates, Harold. 2001. "Black, Japanese, and American: An Asian American Identity Yesterday and Today," in *The Sum of Our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*, edited by Williams-Leon, Teresa and Nakashima, Cynthia. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Turner, M.A., Ross, S.L., Galster, G.C. and Yinger J. 2002. "Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets: National Results from Phase I HDS 2000, U.S. Department of Housing." *Urban Development Report*: Washington, DC.
- Wacquant, Loïc J. D. and Wilson, William Julius. 1989. The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501:8-25.
- Wallace, K. R. 2001. *Relative/Outsider: The Art and Politics of Identity Among Mixed Heritage Students*. Westport, CT: Ablex. □
- Warren, Johnathan and France Winddance Twine. 1997. "White Americans, The New Minority? Non-Blacks and the Ever Expanding Boundaries of Whiteness." *Journal of Black Studies* 4(2):200-218.
- Waters, M.C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Waters, M.C. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Wijeyesinghe, Charmaine L. and Jackson III, Bailey W. 2001. *New Perspectives on Racial Identity Development: A Theoretical and Practical Anthology*. New York: New York University Press.
- Williams-Leon, T.K. 2003. "Check all the Apply" in *New Faces in a Changing America: Multiracial Identity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, edited by Winters, Loretta I. and DeBose, Herman L. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Williams-Leon, T.K. and Nakashima, C. L. 2001. *The Sum of our Parts: Mixed-Heritage Asian Americans*. New York: Sage Publications.

- Williams, Kim M. 2006. *Mark One or More: Civil Rights in Multiracial America*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Wilson, W.J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W.J. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Knopf.
- Winters, Loretta I. and DeBose, Herman L. 2003. *New Faces in a Changing America: Multiracial Identity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Woo, M., Austin, S. B., Williams, D. R., and Bennett, G. G. 2011. "Reconceptualizing the Measurement of Multiracial Status for Health Research in the United States." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 8(1):25–36.
- Wright, Richard, Ellis, Mark and Holloway, Steve. 2011. "Where Black-White Couples Live." *Urban Geography* 32:(1)1-22.
- Xie, Yu and Goyette, Kimberly. 1997. "The Racial Identification of Multiracial Children With One Asian Parent: Evidence From the 1990 Census." *Social Forces* 76:547–70.
- Yancey, George. 2003. *Who is White? Latinos, Asians, and the New Black/Nonblack Divide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Yancey, George. 2007. "Experiencing Racism: Differences in the Experiences of Whites Married to Blacks and Non-Black Racial Minorities." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 38:197-213.
- Yinger, J. 1993. "Audit methodology: Comments." Pp. 259-70 in *Clear and Convincing Evidence: Measurement of Discrimination in America*, edited by Fix, M, Struyk, R.J. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Yinger, J. 1995. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Yinger, J. 1998. "Housing Discrimination is Still Worth Worrying About?" *Housing Policy Debate* 9(4):893-927.